THAT ONE FACE

HERBERT WELCH

FONDREN LECTURES FOR 1924

"THAT ONE FACE"

STUDIES OF AMERICA, CHRIST AND THE FAR EAST

BY

HERBERT WELCH

RESIDENT BISHOP OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH FOR JAPAN AND KOREA

COKESBURY PRESS

IMPORTERS :: PUBLISHERS

NASHVILLE, TENN.

Copyright, 1925
LAMAR & BARTON

Printed in the United States of America

TO

A. F. W.

WIFE, COMRADE, COUNSELOR

A PERSONAL FOREWORD

By the kindness of President C. C. Selecman and Dean Paul B. Kern, with the Committee and the Faculty of the Theological Department of the Southern Methodist University at Dallas, Texas, I was invited to deliver the Fondren Lectures for 1924. That no adequate leisure could be found in the preceding months for a preparation which would meet satisfactorily the standards of such a lectureship, was only too certain. Yet the courtesy of the invitation, the opportunity of discussing before an influential group a favorite and important theme, the prospect of visiting so representative an institution of the sister church with which many of us are hoping soon to be more closely united, and the recent association with that University of my friend and honored colleague in the Orient, Bishop H. A. Boaz, led me to accept the responsibility.

The decision I cannot regret, however far short the product falls of the deserts of the hearers and of my own desires. For the visit was a joy and the appreciation characteristic of Southern hospitality. I shall be glad if these somewhat sketchy discussions may contribute even a little to the bet-

ter understanding of that vast section of our globe with which destiny has so vitally connected this powerful land and of the almost measureless responsibility arising from that power and that connection.

I have made no attempt to rewrite what was spoken in order to conform to the style of more studied composition. It has seemed best to sacrifice the virtues of the library in order to preserve the more direct and informal manner of the lecture-hall.

These chapters are inevitably written from the standpoint of a Christian missionary, and they are addressed primarily to those with a special interest in Christian propaganda. Yet I have hoped that there are also others, who are minded to be world-citizens, who are impressed in these tremendous days with the necessity of an acquaintance with other peoples than our own, who may find in these studies some introduction to a wide field of interest, some incentive to consider, and to cause our country more seriously to consider, what she must be and do in order to meet one of the supreme duties of the hour.

HERBERT WELCH.

CONTENTS

PAGE

A Personal Foreword v

I. Asia and America: the Past 1

II. "East is East"; or What Does the Orient Lack? 22

III. "West is West"; or What Has America to Give? 46

IV. Can "the Twain" "Meet?" the Present ... 67

V. "That One Face" 94

"THAT ONE FACE"

STUDIES OF AMERICA, CHRIST AND THE FAR EAST

I

ASIA AND AMERICA: THE PAST

The lectures which I am to have the privilege of giving have to do most of all with Asia, largest and most populous of the earth's great divisions. In Asia are the highest mountains of the globe; off the coast of Asia are the deepest seas which are to be found. In Asia the extremes meet: the extremes of youth and old age, the extremes of superstition and science, the extremes of poverty and wealth.

Asia has been the source of tradition, romance, and world movements. In Asia, so far as our knowledge goes, the human life of our planet first appeared. In Asia the Son of Mary and Son of God was born. From Asia have come all the chief religions of the race—and any Western cults which can be called religions are rather feeble imitations and dilutions of the faiths of the Asiatics. The reactions between Asia and the

Western hemisphere make a bulky portion of our known history.

When little Japan conquered big Russia in the opening decade of the present century, it was not the first time that Asiatic arms had beaten down the arms of Europe. Invasions of the West by hordes from the steppes of Central Asia began as early as the fourth century, and the Huns, the Magyars, the Finns, the Bulgars, and other hardy peoples mark the results of those irruptions. The Mohammedan hosts from Arabia overran North Africa and South Europe to the very Strait of Gibraltar in the eighth century. And later came the Mongols and Genghis Khan.

But it has not been only by military force that Asia has influenced the Western world. China and Korea had the art of printing with movable types before ever Gutenberg introduced that practice into Europe. Iron-clads, mortars, and bombs, as well as the principle of the suspension bridge, were known in Korea four centuries ago. From China came the invention of gunpowder, the mariners' compass, and the ceramic arts. From Western Asia came our algebra, geometry, and astronomy. If it is true, as Mr. Wells has said, that "the Asiatics are as bold, as vigorous, as generous, as self-sacrificing, and as capable of strong collective action as Europeans," then from Asia we may look for yet larger contributions to the world's progress.

Out of Asia came the stories which excited the imagination of medieval times and led to travel and cupidity. Alexander had already penetrated far into the East, the Roman cohorts had tramped their way over its plains, and the Crusaders had been seeking the Holy Sepulchre across the soil of Syria. Then toward the end of the thirteenth century, the Venetian Marco Polo, accompanied by some Italian priests, made his way to China at the request of the Emperor of that land. His stories set curiosity on fire. The East with its kings and its jewels, its ivories and its silks, its pomp and splendor, seemed to become the goal not only of travelers but of those who sought commercial gain. Some have thought that it was while looking for Japan, and perhaps not primarily for India, that Christopher Columbus set out on his voyage toward the Far East, as he fondly believed. He never even saw the sea which washed the shores of the countries of which he had dreamed, but he was followed by men who did pass from the Atlantic to the Pacific—Balboa, Cortez, Pizarro, and the rest—until Magellan reached the Philippines (only to die there) and Drake circumnavigated the globe. In this fashion during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the Spanish, the Portuguese, the French, the Dutch, the English, the Russians, and the Germans were making their way into Southern and Eastern Asia. Siberia was absorbed by Russia through the eighteenth cen-

tury; India was included in the British Empire by the nineteenth.

And yet after all the excursions and conquests, the mind of the East seemed to be very little touched by these earlier inroads of the West. A close student of the facts has said, "The Asiatic mind remained impervious to European thought. Asiatic customs, Asiatic tribal and family relations, Asiatic religions, long survived Greek and Latin teaching and Greek and Latin cultures. Nay, in all these departments of human activity, as in some others, Asia, even under Roman supremacy, had a continuous and peaceful influence upon her conquerors."

> "The East bowed low before the blast,
> In patient, deep disdain;
> She heard the legions thundering past,
> Then plunged in thought again."

Certain it is that Asiatic religions, Asiatic philosophies, did far more to master Europe than Europe did to master the thought of the East, until a very recent date. Now has come the period of the modern political, commercial, and religious movements of the West toward the East; and the natural resources and the vast populations of Asia have made it irresistibly attractive to the adventurous spirits of all nations.

Of the races of this great historic continent the yellow race is at once the most numerous, the most

progressive, and the most potential. The immediate future of mankind rests with the white race, which constitutes nearly half of the world's population, and with the yellow race, which numbers about one-third of the world's population; and these two races have as their center of contact the Pacific basin.

We have been told long ago, "Westward the star of empire takes its way." It has been true in a very large sense. The earliest civilization of which we have any knowledge lay east of the Mediterranean, and that inland sea constituted the first center of world interest. Then the focal point of importance might be said to have been the North Sea, with the British Isles, France, Germany, Russia (to say nothing of the Scandinavian and Low Countries) grouped about it. But the discovery of America opened a new epoch in history and presently, with the development of the American continents and the rise to wealth and power of Canada and the United States, the Atlantic Ocean defined the arena of the forces shaping modern life. It is still so. Europe and America dominate in the council of nations. The Great War was an Atlantic War. But the trend of interest is still westward; and if one goes west far enough, he will finally come to the Far East. The thought and the adventure of Europe have come around the globe the other way and have traveled east until they have reached the borders

of the Pacific; while the interests of America more and more are discovered to tend westward until they meet those of Europe in the Pacific basin. And the presence in that basin of the great yellow race, so closely connected in its needs, its demands, and its destiny with the controlling white race makes it clear that here and not elsewhere lies the very center of the sweeping circle of earth history in the days just before us. Europe relatively has reached its zenith, the future does not lie with her; the day of vast undeveloped Africa has not yet come. So that the widest of oceans—the Pacific—whose waters wash the shores of four of the six continents of the planet, calls in our day most loudly for the study of world statesmen and world citizens.

That this is no partial view fostered by a mere missionary inclination, is demonstrated by the words of men eminent in public life and disinterested in attitude. It is nearly three quarters of a century since one of our greatest Secretaries of State, William H. Seward, said, "The Pacific Ocean, its shores, its islands and the vast region beyond, will become the chief theater of events in the world's great hereafter"; and that "the world's great hereafter" is already at hand is witnessed by the words of more recent students. Said Roosevelt, "The Mediterranean era died with the discovery of America; the Atlantic era has reached the height of its development; the Pacific

era, destined to be the greatest of all, is just at its dawn." Mr. Lloyd-George remarked two or three years ago, "The problems of to-day may be Atlantic. Yesterday they were in the German Ocean, and they may pass to-morrow into the Pacific, and when they do the powers that are most greatly concerned in the Pacific are America, Japan, China, and the British Empire." President Harding said, "Yesterday we thought of the broad Pacific as separating two unrelated worlds; now we have come to regard it as a world by itself, the greatest of neighborhoods." And I quote finally the words of one who as a student of world affairs will rank with any one of those whom I have mentioned—General Jan Smuts of South Africa, who observes, "Undoubtedly the scene has shifted away from Europe to the Far East and the Pacific. The problems of the Pacific are to my mind the world problems of the next fifty years or more."

What are the problems of the Pacific? If they were to be considered as a whole, we should have to take into consideration Latin America, which borders the great ocean from our southern boundaries to the Strait of Magellan. Here are questions of Oriental immigration, of the exploitation of natural resources and the growth of world trade. We should give large place to the British Dominion on our north, bigger than all our forty-eight states put together. We must not forget

Alaska, Kamchatka, and the whole of Siberia—a realm so huge that all of Europe could be buried in it and leave one-third of its territory untouched. We must take into account the Philippines, nearly as large as Japan, and other islands, whether under American, British, or Japanese control. The French, Dutch, and British possessions of southeastern Asia must not be overlooked. Malaysia houses 40,000,000 people and might, it is estimated, care for 600,000,000. And yonder are Australia and New Zealand, a continent of wide areas and boundless futures, barely touched. It is estimated that in these various lands bordering the Pacific additional populations of a billion could be sustained. Their natural possibilities and resources are, at the very least, immense.

But the limitations both of time and of knowledge forbid consideration of the problems of the Pacific in this inclusive meaning. This discussion must be confined to the United States, and to China, Japan, Korea, the home of the yellow race. By the *Orient,* or the *Far East,* I mean then Eastern Asia as represented in these three countries; by *America* I mean only the United States of America; and it is the obligation of this *America* to this *Orient* which we are to consider.

The question might be raised, Why is there any obligation? Under what bonds has America been placed to the Orient? The first word of the answer is very simple, "No nation liveth to itself." The

development of human history has been from small to larger social units. Beginning with the family, of course, has come the union of several related families into the clan or tribe. When once the nomadic life of fishing, hunting, herding, and chronic warfare was over and when man reached the more settled agricultural stage of civilization, then tribes and clans consolidated into national units. There was a tendency to think of the nation as a self-controlled, self-sufficient, and exclusive body, but it was soon discerned that there could be no such thing as national isolation. God "made of one every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth, having determined their appointed seasons and the bounds of their habitation." There may be division of territory and difference of task, but they are of one origin, one blood, and one destiny. All nations are bound up in the bundle of life together. What injures one cannot be an advantage to another; what helps one helps all.

This was always true. Greece and Persia had their living links; Syria and Egypt found their fates intertwined; Roman and Carthaginian could not remain apart; and Saxon and Celt had to learn how to live together. The Old World and the New began to touch. Migrations, conquests, the spread of learning, traversed national boundaries. Broadly speaking, there is no unmixed blood. And what was always the fact since primitive and bar-

barous days has been intensified by modern conditions. Increased facilities for transportation and communication have in the last century made the world one neighborhood, and no man, no nation, may with impunity ignore the obligations of neighborliness.

We are debtors, one to another: Jew to Greek and Greek to Jew; French to German and German to French; Britain to Japan and Japan to Britain; America to China and China to America. Each receives from every other and in turn gives to every other. The plague in Manchuria means peril in all Pacific ports. An earthquake in Japan may affect steel and timber and raw silk and textile markets in America and in Europe. What have even we self-satisfied Americans that we did not receive? Our literature, our language, our science, our architecture, our music, our social organization, our political ideals—are they something which we have solely invented and created, or are they the fruits of the travail and anguish of many centuries and many lands? To take an attitude of national aloofness, to say that "Europe may stew in its own juice," to declare that we free and independent Americans will have no "entangling alliances," but will go our own serene and selfish way, is at once unhistorical, illogical, and impossible. "No nation liveth to itself."

Now, if the strong have any obligation to the weak, if the educated have any obligation to the

unlearned, if the rich have any obligation to the poor, if the healthy have any obligation to the sick, if the advanced have any obligation to the backward, then our prosperous and progressive West has a special obligation to the East, where old civilizations of a high order—with ancient attainments in philosophy and science and art and literature far surpassing our own at that time—have, through some mischance, been arrested.

The United States of America by common recognition is the leader of this favored and enlightened West, and "from him to whom much is given much will be required." The heavy end of whatever obligation exists to needy races is upon us Americans. Unless we deny duty, humanity, God, there is no escape.

Evidently, however, the United States cannot bear all the burden. If special responsibility is to be apportioned, it would seem that the leading countries of Europe should help first of all their European neighbors, second, the races of Africa and the Near East, and third, their own dependencies (England, for instance, has a special obligation to India); while the United States should assume a closer connection in this matter to South America and to the Far East. That is primarily a question of geographical relations. The terms Near East and Far East were coined from the standpoint of London, and what is Far East to England is "near East" to us. Our nearest

Asiatic neighbors are the people with yellow faces; and they are nearer to us than to any other advanced Christian nation. I do not ignore Canada, but its population is less than one-tenth of our own. I do not ignore Australia, but here is scarcely half the population of Canada. The only populous, strong, rich, white Western nation near to Eastern Asia is our own. It takes five or six weeks to go from London to Shanghai, but one can go from San Francisco in three weeks and by traveling by way of Seattle one can save another three or four days on the trans-Pacific voyage. The Panama Canal has brought even our Atlantic ports near to the Orient. Our Aleutian Islands stretch out friendly arms almost to the shores of Asia. At Bering Strait only a few miles of sea separate our Alaska from Asiatic Russia. The aeroplanes of the around-the-world flyers made no very long hops in seeking a route from California to Japan. Geography creates obligation.

The special historical relation of the United States to the Orient has already been hinted at. It is true that while the Spanish, English, Dutch and French were sailing and contending in Pacific waters in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, America had not yet arrived. But as soon as our national life had fairly begun, the first American vessel reached China, in 1784. The Oriental trade of New England in the days which followed was of interest and importance, although it presently

dropped for half a century, until the dawn of our new era of expansion.

We were the nation to open Japan to Western intercourse in modern times. Such action had earlier been contemplated (for example, by John Quincy Adams in 1816), but finally in 1853 Commodore Perry, bearing his message from President Fillmore, somewhat peremptorily, it may be, began the negotiations which forced open certain Japanese ports to Western commerce.

In Korea our country was the first to enter from the West, and American citizens, favored by the Korean Government, took the most prominent part in early improvements in the Hermit Kingdom—the building of railroads, electric lines, and water-works, and the opening of gold mines.

But the point I am making does not refer to the chronology of contact so much as to the fact that the treatment of the Oriental nations by America has been, on the whole, somewhat different from that of other Western countries. Some Americans, indeed, including Perry and Seward, urged an aggressive policy, or at least a policy of extension, such as found expression in the raising of the American flag over Formosa in the '50's, and later came to the surface in the taking of the Philippines. But in general the American policy was one of co-operation with European powers so far as that was consistent with building up strong Asiatic states. That is, on the one hand it was

not a policy of nationalistic isolation, and on the other it made the welfare of the countries with which it was dealing a prime object in its transactions.

This general attitude naturally has produced a friendly reaction. China in earlier centuries had extended a warm welcome to foreigners, but through unhappy experiences she had grown suspicious. She found foreigners mixing in her politics, trying to control her trade and dominate her domestic affairs. Then came the Opium Wars, the British and French attacks on Peking, and the securing by military force of the opening of ports and foreign residential privileges. The Chinese began to think that these Westerners were in truth "foreign devils" come to destroy their native rights. But, happily, one of the early American Ministers to China, Anson Burlingame, gained the confidence of the Chinese by his integrity and foresight to such a degree that he actually headed a mission to foreign countries to win for China more favorable treatment. In 1868 our own Government by treaty with China "disavowed any right to interfere with its eminent domain or sovereign jurisdiction over its subjects and property." We have never had in China a "sphere of influence": when England, Japan, France, Russia, and for a time Germany, were seeking and setting off sections of the country which they might develop and to some extent con-

trol, America stood to one side. When indemnities were demanded and obtained because of the destruction of foreign life and property by the Boxers, America led the way in returning a large part of the amount received that it might be used for the education of Chinese youth.

Similarly in Japan. Perry came with warships, but he came also with tact and was able to achieve his object by no force other than moral suasion; so that he has come to be regarded by the Japanese as a national benefactor. When in the next decade the warships of our own and European nations had unjustifiably bombarded the port of Shimonoseki and exacted a large indemnity from Japan, our people at least had the grace to be ashamed and after twenty years returned the money to Japan, who accepted the gift "as a strong manifestation of that spirit of justice and equity which has always animated the United States in its relations with Japan." Our nation was the first to agree to the relinquishment of extra-territorial rights; and since then, under Roosevelt, followed by Root, Lansing, and Hughes, the spirit manifested toward the Sunrise Kingdom has been one not merely of justice but of positive friendship.

When contentions have arisen between the peoples of Eastern Asia, the United States has tried to be the friend of all. We were thanked by both China and Japan for our good offices dur-

ing their war in the '90's. I wish I could believe, literally and without qualification or exception, that the words of James Brown Scott were true—"The policy of this Government has invariably been one of sympathetic interest in and towards the Far East, and it has never sought to make of the needs and distresses of Japan and China a source of profit." But at least it may be claimed without fear of contradiction, that our conduct has been relatively fair, humane, and generous. We are in no position to play the Pharisee and thank God that we are not as other nations! We have shown some imperialistic tendencies; we have made our mistakes. Yet that which we have succeeded in doing in friendliness provides the most admirable foundation for sympathetic and helpful relations in the future.

We are bound to these countries by strong and growing commercial ties. Our trade with the Japanese Empire (including Korea) is larger than with China, India, and the Straits Settlements combined. Our cotton, iron, steel, timber, oil, are sold to her in great quantities; more than a quarter of all she purchases from other countries goes from America. From her in turn we receive silk, pottery, and tea, with many minor products; we buy over two-fifths of all that she ships abroad, and of her principal export, raw silk, this country takes 95 per cent. In eight years the portion of Japan's total foreign trade which came from or

went to America, rose from 23 per cent to 37 per cent. True, only about 8 per cent of our own foreign trade is with Japan, but there are, after all, few countries which are more important to the United States from the commercial viewpoint than the Land of the Rising Sun. As it has recently been summed up: "The trade between this country and Japan has been a large and thriving one. In the fiscal year ended June 30, 1923, we sold to Japan $213,000,000 worth of goods and bought from her $372,500,000 worth. France, Germany, Great Britain and Canada were the only countries that bought more from us, and Great Britain, Canada, and Cuba were the only countries from which we bought more. Exports to Japan were 82 per cent as great as our exports to all of South America." Thus closely connected with Japan by bonds of trade and common financial interest—more closely than with any other non-Christian country—there is at once an opportunity and an obligation which rest peculiarly upon us.

American trade with China is nearly half as large as with Japan. Outside of Europe and North America, no other countries but Japan and Argentine buy more from us than China. The flag need not follow trade, but it is natural for thought, interest, good-will, to do so. Where even our material "treasure" is, there our hearts should be also!

In industrial development the Orient follows

the Occident. Buyers of our machinery, diligent students of our methods, the industrial leaders of the East, where they have not themselves been trained in the United States, look to the progressive (though often in their thought materialistic) republic of the West for guidance.

The English language comes nearer in the Far East to being an international tongue than any other. In Japan it is taught (with the exception of the Chinese ideographs, so fundamental to all the literatures of Eastern Asia) as the first and foremost foreign language of the schools above primary grade. The reading of English is therefore common, the speaking less so. In China similar tendencies to the use of English are not so far developed, and in Korea they are in their incipiency. The total result in the Orient, however, is both the translation and the reading in the original of great numbers of American as well as English books and magazines. The educated, at least, are drinking from some of the same classical founts from which we have drawn our inspiration.

In music, law, medicine, and perhaps pure science, the East has leaned more heavily upon Europe than upon America, although in applied science, in surgery and in dentistry, the United States would be taken more nearly as a model. But the lines of travel, sport, and social customs (the latter being modified through these multi-

plied contacts) lead more directly to our shores. Education in all these lands is deeply indebted to American ideals, though Germany has had a share in determining educational organization and method. The school system of Japan was planned by an American missionary; and the presence continually in our colleges, universities, and technical schools of several thousands of Korean, Japanese, and Chinese students bears eloquent testimony to the esteem in which our teachers and institutions are held.

China has modeled her government after the American republic, though its purpose of democracy is still obscured by chaotic political conditions. The constitution of Japan was shaped after careful study of many lands, and is a composite document influenced by European as well as American ideas, all of them adapted to Asiatic conditions. But if not an imitator of our republican and federal form of government, she is a careful observer and ready to align herself in national policies with the Anglo-Saxon peoples.

When it comes to Christian missions in the East, it is simple matter of fact that America stands first. France, England, Ireland, Canada, Australia, Scotland, Denmark, and others are making their contributions, but the largest force laboring for the Christianization of the Orient and thus touching the life of these nations where it is deepest, comes from our own country.

And it is not too much to say that in the Far East there has been felt toward this country an unusual respect, based on its recognized power and wealth and advancement in the practical arts, as well as upon that belief in its idealism which has somewhat replaced the notion that Uncle Sam is completely commercialized in his ambitions; that there has been general confidence in the righteousness of our national aims; and that there has been a degree of personal liking and affection which has been inspired by the best types of our citizenry living in the Orient.

In noting these points of contact and these lines of influence, I am not thinking of pride but of opportunity; not of complacency but of obligation.

> "Oh, East is East and West is West,
> And never the twain shall meet";

and there most of us usually stop. But you will remember the lines that follow:

> "But there is neither East nor West,
> Border nor breed nor birth,
> When two strong men stand face to face,
> Though they come from the ends of the earth."

And here you have two strong men facing each other, the yellow man and the white man, strong men both, brought together through these hurrying centuries in the providence of God, and facing

each other now across the Pacific Ocean. What is the obligation of America as representing the dominant white race toward the men of the great yellow race? That question I hope to discuss in the succeeding chapters.

II

"EAST IS EAST"; OR WHAT DOES THE ORIENT LACK?

ATTENTION has been called to the fact that Asia, with which we are dealing, is the largest and most populous of the continents. It is decidedly the largest—so large that Europe and Africa thrown together do not equal it; the single continent of Asia contains about 30 per cent of the land areas of the globe. It also houses more people than all the others put together; that is to say, it is so populous that it contains more than one-half of the entire human race. Therefore Asia is not only large, but relatively crowded. There are smaller countries elsewhere, to be sure, more densely populated, but there is no country so large as some of the Asiatic countries which is called upon to provide for such masses of people as are there contained.

I have sometimes illustrated it in this way: If we could conceive of all the people on the face of the earth being lifted temporarily into the air, and then, beginning on January first, being replaced in the states or countries to which they belong, one person each day on each square

mile of surface, the entire population of Nevada, let us say, would be at home before the end of New Year's day, for there is less than one person to the square mile in that state. If the United States were considered as a single unit, its entire population would be back (one person to each square mile each day that passed) early in February. If we dealt with the population of Korea on the same plan, it would take until about the Fourth of July. If at the same rate we put back the population of China (the eighteen provinces) it would take until Labor Day; and if we patiently pursue our course long enough we should have Japan repopulated by Christmas. Asia, I say, speaking especially of these countries of Eastern Asia, is relatively crowded.

Now, taking into account the fact that the other five continents are already practically under the control of white races and are largely closed against the Asiatic, it would seem under those conditions that "Asia for the Asiatics" is a motto which all should consider reasonable; but history does not so indicate. Western nations have so far taken the control of Asia itself out of the hands of the Asiatics that it has actually come to pass that less than one-seventh of the land surface of the earth is under the political control of Asiatic peoples, although these constitute more than one-half of the earth's inhabitants.

That situation gives rise to such utterances as

this (I quote the words of a somewhat cynical newspaper of Japan, and yet the caustic quality of its speech is not hard to account for): "The so-called Anglo-Saxon domination of the world is being steadily carried into effect. All the sweet juice of the world is about to be sucked by them. Will God make them really happy?" And some of the facts of Asiatic history have been such as to lead even so sweet a spirit as Mr. Gandhi to use words as bitter as these: "The British Empire is based upon organized exploitation of physically weaker races and upon a continuous exhibition of brute force." This is a phase of world opinion which the white peoples must take into account.

When one remembers the spheres of influence in China, the situation becomes more startling. What do we mean by a "sphere of influence"? It has come to be a common political term. The sphere of influence is primarily a commercial fact. It means that a certain section of China is set apart by more or less common consent, to be exploited in matters of trade and development by a certain foreign nation to the exclusion of other nations and often to the limitation of the efforts of the Chinese themselves. Russia has had a sphere of influence in China equal to two-thirds of the area of the entire United States. England has had a sphere of influence somewhat less, and Japan still less; although perhaps the existence of a Japanese sphere of influence has been made

most prominent for certain purposes before the thought of the world. I am not reckoning this sphere of influence as entirely out of Chinese control; Chinese sovereignty remains in name and to some extent in fact. But can we wonder at a certain antagonistic attitude of the Chinese when Western nations, and Japan working with them, portioned out so large a part of China that the fraction not covered by "spheres of influence" was approximately limited to the province around Peking? Moreover, China has been until recently dotted with foreign post-offices, so that letters could be mailed in Shanghai or in Peking with British or American or Japanese stamps on them and the Chinese post-office had no share in handling them. What with foreign courts of justice and foreign concessions, and the employment of foreigners in positions of influence, the Chinese have been left out of much of the administration of their own country. The customs service of China, the post-office, the salt gabelle, are organized under the leadership of foreigners, responsible to the Chinese Government but controlling great branches of government activity and large numbers of men.

I do not undertake to discuss all the reasons for this division between foreigners and Orientals in the Far East itself. One must in any event admit that the foreigners have been responsible, even Christian foreigners, for many invasions of

native right. The Roman Catholic Church has insisted upon official recognition of its higher officers. It has taken the position that Chinese members of the Roman Catholic Church are no longer under the jurisdiction of their own native courts but when found guilty of misdemeanors are to be dealt with through the church. Membership in an institution having its headquarters in a Western country has been used to interfere with the right of China to deal with its own citizens. If the peoples of Asia have any spirit of national pride, any sense of human worth, they cannot endure such treatment without resenting it.

Japan learned a generation ago to resist this tendency of the West to dominate the East. Unhappily Japan had to learn, and she learned it from the very beginning, that the only way in which such dispositions could be resisted at that time was by a display of armed power; and Japan was compelled by the pressure of Western military civilization to equip herself in military strength. She was thus able to assert her rights as an Oriental nation even against the white race, and Japan, by force of that self-assertion, has become the leader of the East in withstanding the inroads of the West. She secured relief from extra-territoriality and from the restrictions which the Western nations were imposing on her customs regulations, as they are even yet imposing on those of China. She came to be reckoned among

the great powers of the world; and, to our shame be it said, she was recognized as a great power only after she had fought her way to the front. Before that, the Westerner's regard for the Japanese was such as is felt toward a somewhat precocious child. They were said by one observer to be looked upon as something halfway between the barbarous Hottentots and the really civilized Westerners! They were sometimes petted, and in a rather condescending way approved; and then when we found out that Japan had the ability to be a self-respecting and self-asserting nation, we began to mistrust and antagonize her.

We have been hearing much about the attitude of Japan toward China and toward Korea, and these international relations are facts that cannot be ignored. These three countries have their own cultural background; in their written language they are closely related; their geographical nearness, their racial organization, their color, their fundamental philosophy, their connection with Buddhism and Confucianism, all bring them close together and give them many points of sympathetic contact. This is recognized on favorable occasions in the Orient. In 1911 a Chinese prince is said to have gone to the extreme of urging that China and Japan should drop their differences, even dissolve their national boundaries if necessary, in order to resist degradation and enslavement if not destruction by the white race.

Yet Japan's policy toward China has often been one of aggression. She has still no political mastery—she must have seen that the attempt would be futile; but Japan seems to have a policy looking to a unique position in Chinese affairs and to the holding of certain special privileges in particular sections of China which are accorded to no other nation. And Japan has come to dominate entirely the life of Korea. First it was by a protectorate, and finally by complete annexation; so that Korea a dozen years ago became a part of the Japanese Empire.

But it must not be forgotten that, of whatever encroachment Japan (following Western examples) has been guilty, she yet has stood as the champion of the East against the West, and she has succeeded in organizing the one strong effective Asiatic government. It may be true—it is rather difficult to pronounce in sweeping terms—but it may be true, as has been claimed, that Persia and Turkey and China are all worse off than before the coming to them of modern forms of government, that is, before their recent attempts at creating a system of self-government. Certain it is that in China there is not only financial but political chaos. It has no government that really functions. It is in a continual state of civil war. Peace-loving as the Chinese people are, they are supporting a standing army of perhaps one and a half million men, which is presumably

the largest on the face of the earth. But with all the unrest and conflict and revolution, Eastern Asia is working at, and must finally work out, its own problems.

What is this East? The East is truly to the Westerner a mystery, a puzzle. Perhaps Western ideas about Korea are not so clearly formed, but I have found rather well-defined thoughts about Japan and China in the minds of many American people. The Japanese people are commonly regarded as a tricky people, deceptive in their ways, cheats and liars by very nature; men who are copiers without conscience, dishonest in business (even that hoary lie as to the employment of Chinese cashiers in Japanese banks is still in circulation), shifty in diplomacy, never keeping their word. "For ways that are dark and tricks that are vain, the heathen Chinee" is no longer counted as "peculiar." The Japanese are said to be superficial—alert, quick, imitative, but with no originality. They are called over-bearing, insolent to those below them, and cringing to those above. They are characterized as ambitious, aggressive, militaristic in organization and spirit, imperialistic in aim, the very "Prussians of the East." Of these allegations, some are absurdly false, some are at least misleading, some need a background of larger knowledge that they may be rightly understood.

And what China is, who shall say? Someone

has declared that "China is not a country or nation, but a civilization." China is not a country, it is true, but a continent, not a nation but a race. Is China the Cantonese boat-dweller or the grave and cultured Mandarin? The eager student or the contented coolie? The shriveled, clamorous old woman, or the bright-eyed, modern girl? Is China C. T. Wang or Chang Tso Lin? Who shall say what China is, or what Japan is? I despair of presenting a picture which can give any just idea of these mysterious civilizations. I shall have to content myself with picking out a very few items, which may afford a mere suggestion of the Orient of to-day.

Let me mention the health and sanitation which are fundamental to the strength, endurance, and progress of a people. Japan here stands quite apart from other countries of the Orient. Modern science, including medical science, has made rapid headway in the Sunrise Kingdom. Hospitals have been built, sanitary regulations have been enforced, and in Korea as well as in the rest of the Empire the great epidemics have been almost eliminated.

In China the case is different: cholera is one of the perilous and prevalent diseases; smallpox so common that one rubs shoulders with it with almost no thought or attention; leprosy, pitifully disfiguring thousands. Leper colonies are in all parts of the country. The bubonic plague is

virulent, while the pneumonic plague is even more fatal, despite the fight being made against it under the leadership of Dr. L. T. Wu, one of the most brilliant of medical men. Tuberculosis makes its deadly inroads. Famine, arising from drouth and failure in proper irrigation (or from lack of transportation) is still frequently recurrent; foot-binding, though outlawed, is yet so common that away from the chief centers in China to-day, seventy millions of women and girls are said to be walking with bound feet. The use of opium, which seemed in the way of being stamped out of the great Eastern republic a few years ago, now is officially recognized once more, and the poppy is being grown in most of the provinces of China. There is also the prevalence of eye trouble, and deformities which in many communities make the heart sick.

Let me speak a few words about the industrialism of the Far East. The Orientals are just fairly beginning the development of their natural resources and of modern factory organization. In China are vast stores of coal and iron which the world covets; it is rich in other minerals, as well as in timber and oil; though it is being exploited against its own will, sometimes even to the detriment of the Chinese themselves. But now under Chinese auspices are beginning to be built many mills and factories. Of what sort are they? In the cotton mills of China forty per cent of the

workers are women and forty per cent are children; only one-fifth are men. The wages of the men are from fifteen to twenty cents a day, of the women from ten to twelve cents, and of the children from five to ten cents a day. The average hours of work are twelve and most of the toilers work seven days a week. In match factories in China, boys and girls not more than nine years of age are working from four o'clock in the morning until eight o'clock at night; and from one such factory it is reported that about eighty are ordinarily sent to the hospital each day for treatment for diseases occasioned by the cheap phosphorus and the cheap sulphur used that the mill operators may heap up dividends. With overwork and under-pay, with malnutrition and exhaustion and lack of sanitation, do you wonder at the organization of labor unions and the occurrence of strikes? Thank God for strikes under such circumstances! For unless men learn that human beings must not be treated worse than beasts would be treated, we shall never have industrial progress. In sections such pittances are paid for labor that forty to fifty per cent of the people are held below a decent living standard. Do you wonder that, though the birth rate of the Orient is high, its death rate is also high?

In Japan industrial development has progressed to a much higher pitch. Only one-sixth of the land of Japan is tillable. Japan's problem is

food for her rapidly growing population, and an adequate supply of raw materials, in which she is exceedingly poor, as well as assured markets for the products of her factories. The movement is from country to city. More than 100,000 women in Japan are working in mines under conditions that are unspeakable before a Western audience. Of 700,000 women working in spinning-mills, three-fourths live in dormitories provided by the mills, many under physical and moral conditions that are repulsive. Children are found working from ten to fourteen hours a day. Think of nine people in Tokyo slums sleeping and living in a room, six by six feet! And wages have by no means kept pace with the high cost of living. All the horrors of our Western industrialism are being foisted on the Oriental as he turns from the field to the factory to live under modern competition.

Let me speak of the status of womanhood in the Orient. Some of these women dwell in beautiful homes. Some of them wear handsome clothes. Some of them have faces to which smiles are by no means strange. They have their children and their love. Perhaps in the essentials of womanhood they are not very different from their more privileged sisters in Western lands. And yet there is a vast difference, after all. It is only a few years ago that in Korea they thought it was not even worth while to give a girl a name; she

did not count. And while it is by no means a common happening, one still may find to-day in some of the country districts of China girl babies peddled about in baskets and sold for perhaps a dollar apiece.

But the girl grows up, she is ready to go to school. In some of our Eastern countries the school door is not ready to swing open either for boys or girls. In China, until lately, schools were not open for even one child out of ten. In Japan, where the state has provided a complete system of education from the kindergarten to the imperial universities, even as early as the third year of school life, a Japanese woman tells us, the difference between the boy and the girl begins to show itself. It is not thought that the girl needs as advanced instruction as the boy. The set of moral duties which she is taught is quite different from that which is placed before the boy for his admonition. And the atmosphere of these schools, says this observer, is the atmosphere of the convent. The girls are shut away from actual life. When it comes to the higher institutions, we have in these Eastern lands only a beginning of education for the ambitious young women, who, roused by the touch of modern life, stirred by what they learn of their Western sisters, are eager to have their minds enlarged and their vision widened until it sweeps over the whole world; but the opportunities are not there. Universities and col-

leges are still almost unknown names in women's circles in the East.

Then there is the social life. In the Orient there is very little of that free and wholesome mingling of unmarried young people of the two sexes, such as we have in the United States, for example, which makes society interesting and sweet. We do not dare even in our schools, unless it be for an experiment in the very lowest grades, to have our boys and girls together in the East. It has not been expected there that woman shall be a real comrade of man. The husband has not looked for his wife to be his intellectual mate. In Japan, if he seeks for companionship, he has been accustomed to find it with the geisha girls; and, indeed, some of the modern-minded women of Japan have been afraid to show in company how intelligent they are, lest they should be thought to be immodest and competing with these professional entertainers! In Korea we have the system of concubinage and in China that of plural marriage. The Christian home, founded on pure love between man and woman, developed through open courtship, based on intimate acquaintance and meaning the solemn union of soul between one man and one woman—ah, what would not the Christian home mean if it could prevail in the Orient! There marriage is largely a matter of family arrangement, and divorce is fatally easy if the husband chances not to be pleased. In a city

in Japan, of perhaps one hundred thousand, a missionary said to me: "I do not know of one happy home in this whole city, except the few homes where Jesus Christ has gone."

The women of the Orient are used to work. They have always worked, millions of them, as house servants and as farm hands. Sometimes in Japan I have seen a woman, with a little baby strapped upon her back, carrying bricks. As one rides through China he may even see the women with bound feet stumping through the streets or toiling in the fields. But now new avenues of occupation are opening. The women are becoming authors, journalists, and teachers, and many of the doors of modern business swing open at the touch of a woman's hand. With the railroads, the telegraph and telephone companies, as secretaries, clerks, and bookkeepers, more than a million find occupation now in Japan alone—Japan, which is most advanced in the adoption of the circumstances of modern life. Many of them are earning from $300 to $1,500 per year. I was interested to note down half a dozen rules given to these self-supporting and self-respecting young business women in Japan recently. They were: First, do not be servile or coquettish; second, learn how to be silent; third, when speaking, speak distinctly, politely, and with dignity; fourth, when men blame you for their own mistakes, take the blame and be silent; fifth, be exact in everything; sixth,

have religion. This is a series of rules not only excellent at some points for young women of all countries, but very enlightening as to the position which womanhood still occupies in the Orient. Of course, in the East as in the West, we have the new woman, the woman who exercises social influence and who even enters politics. Some of the recent candidates for provincial assemblies in China have been women. Woman is beginning to assume her place both in business and in society; but how backward is her position compared with the women of the West!

I should not do justice to the present situation if I were not to speak of the growth of the democratic movement. When you consider the recent growth of democracy, you must remember not only Germany, Austria, Russia, if you please, but also China, Korea, Japan. China, where through great travail a republic has been established in form and where the people are determined, however long it may take, to establish it in fact; Korea, where the Independence Movement five years ago brought a new life and vigor to the people; and even Japan. In Japan, which is often called "the last of the great autocracies," democracy is advancing; for democracy is not so much a matter of form as it is of the spirit of government. In that Empire there is a growing freedom of speech and of publication. There is a vigorous demand for universal manhood suffrage. There

is a steady approach to government by cabinets responsible under a party system to the representatives of the people. There has been growth in socialism; but better grounds for hope are found in the incipient class consciousness of the labor group, the development of the influence of womanhood, and the existence of a very large student group, especially in centers like Tokyo (which is one of the great student centers of the world) where the University element is prevailingly liberal and progressive. Many men of station and strength are liberal in social theory and are ready to put Japan in the forefront of democracy. Japanese newspapers complain sometimes of the failure of representative government; and it must be admitted that democracy in the Orient labors under the handicap of the strongly intrenched family system, which tends to impair individual initiative. The sentiment of subjection to paternalistic regulation finds expression in the Chinese proverb: "If my parents have betrothed me to a chicken, I will fly with the chicken; if they have betrothed me to a dog, I will run with the dog." I have known full-grown men not willing to have their hair cut without consulting their fathers! Personal considerations seem everywhere in the Orient to outweigh principles. There is even to-day an emphasis in Japan on the old relations which created feudalism and which are obstacles to democracy. But in spite of all, de-

mocracy grows, helped noticeably by the influences which played upon the Prince Regent during and following his recent European trip. The same conflict which is on in the West is on in the East. There it is the conflict between militarism and bureaucracy on the one hand, and liberalism and democracy on the other. The issue is not doubtful, but the conflict is not done.

There is under way a moral conflict as well as a political conflict. Suicides are pitifully common. The liquor traffic and drunkenness are growing in the Far East. Social vice is open and unashamed. Gambling, selfishness, cruelty, superstition, materialism, are rife. You say that we ourselves have all of those, and that the West can scarcely claim advantage over the East. It is true that there are people in the United States as wicked as in any country on the face of the earth, men who are as vile, as base, and as selfish as any; but here you have more people on the other side to make the fight for decency and for righteousness, and, in addition, you have created a standard of public opinion which puts props around the individual and holds him upright when without those helps he would often crumble and go to pieces morally.

The East has, however, its own virtues of loyalty, of reverence, family piety, self-restraint, respect for the past; and it has other forces fighting against evil tendencies. Education is helping

to blot out ignorance, fear, and superstition. China now has well over four million children in the public schools. In Korea, Japan, education is moving forward by leaps and bounds. A reading and questioning public is being created. Before the earthquake there were said to be 1,200 book shops in Tokyo. General intelligence is a necessity of self-government, and the East is eager to learn. But even that is not enough.

There is a call in the Orient to-day, not simply for intelligence but for religion. Let me take Japan as my example, since in this matter, as in many others, she leads the way in the Far East. Confucianism, with its sturdy ethics, has had and even to-day still has a strong hold upon the thinking of the older intellectuals and of the military classes. Highest in the esteem of many intelligent people in Japan among all the world's books are the Confucian classics.

Shinto, with its thirteen sects, is the national cult of Japan. It inculcates loyalty to family, to feudal lord, and to Emperor. Whether its rites are a religious or only a patriotic observance, is constantly in dispute. Whether its respect for the Emperor is mere loyal honor or religious worship, so as to constitute idolatry, has not yet been settled by any general agreement. Shinto means "the way of the gods." Its oldest documents are filled with wonder-tales reminiscent of the early

Greek and Latin mythologies. In them Japan is represented as the home of the gods, and the first Emperor (some 600 to 700 years B.C.) as of divine origin, a descendant of the Sun-Goddess, the supreme deity among the confused and crowding nature gods. While Shinto claims its sixteen million adherents in Japan, no sharp line of distinction is drawn between the Shintoists and the Buddhists. The same persons use the ceremonies of both on occasion. They are not regarded as mutually exclusive religions.

Buddhism was at one time established by law in the Land of the Rising Sun, where it has dwelt for more than a thousand years; but now, though richly endowed, it stands as an independent body. It has had many teachers of note and exists in correspondingly various forms or sects. Among the most spiritual is the Shin sect, dating from about 1200 A.D. In this, protest is made against the monasticism which is so common in Buddhism; and democracy, universal brotherhood, the dignity of manual labor, and similar teachings, are exalted. Its priests point to egotism as the root of tyranny, autocracy, militarism, imperialism, commercialism, and all other tainted tendencies; and insist that true peace and happiness are to be attained by yielding to the nobler and more enlightened impulse of altruism. The Buddha is quoted as praying:

Sentient beings, however numberless, I vow to save them all;
Evil passions, however inexhaustible, I vow to uproot them all;
Depths of knowledge, however fathomless, I vow to sound them all.

It is difficult, when one considers original Buddhism, to escape the conclusion that here are Christian ideas which have made their way in the later centuries into the temples where Buddha is still the supreme name.

It must not be overlooked that behind and beneath these ancient Eastern faiths is the primitive animism, the popular belief in evil spirits to be frightened away, or propitiated, or tricked into harmlessness—that haunting shadow of fear which broods over the whole Oriental world, whatever its professed religion, and makes life a succession of disasters or escapes.

Christianity came into China first about 600 A.D.; into Korea and Japan a thousand or more years later. Its enrolled adherents in any one of these countries do not exceed two per cent of the population—"a contemptible little army," it would seem. But the significant fact to be noted —notwithstanding such reactions as the Chinese students' revolt against Christianity, on the ground that it is opposed to modern science and promotes militarism and capitalism—is that Christian ideas and ideals and motives and impulses

are gradually permeating the activities of the East, until the Christian religion has an influence and a part in the life of the nations by no means measured by the size of the Christian church. So good a witness as Prince Tokugawa, President of the House of Peers, has testified concerning Japan:

> There is no doubt that Christianity has already spread its roots wide and deep in Japanese soil. The Japanese newspapers, magazines, and fictions of to-day bear testimony to this statement. The prevailing popular conception of mankind and humanity, and of liberty, equality, and fraternity, may be traced directly or indirectly to Christianity.

It is not strange that gifts have repeatedly been made by the Imperial family to the Salvation Army, the Young Men's Christian Association, and other similar agencies, when one observes the efforts for reform and social betterment under Christian leadership or inspiration. The temperance movement, the purity movement, the organized labor movement, and various philanthropies owe all to Christian leaders. Japanese Government officials seek out Christians again and again to organize relief work or to take charge of needy children. Public opinion on social standards and on national and world policies, as well as ideals of international peace, have been shaped unconsciously by Christian principles. The very religions of the Orient have been touched and to

some extent transformed by Christian sentiments. I have found spiritual profit in a Buddhist book like *The Priest and His Followers,* which has run through its hundred editions—a book professedly and completely Buddhist, with the single exception that its loveliest thoughts are Christian and not properly Buddhist at all!

What a mixture and a mystery, in its politics, its industry, its physical, its intellectual, and its moral life is this Orient! This Eastern world—would that I could make you see it—"weary and heavy laden," awakening, restless, anxious, turning its yearning and hopeful eyes to the West!

Old World, you are full of dreams—
  Dreams of your beautiful past;
Of those rich, lost days of pomp and praise—
  Times that have vanished fast.
I see a light in your ancient eyes
  Like embers dying at last.

Old World, I am tired of things now dead,
  Of memories, and prayers long said;
I sigh for the quickening pulse of youth,
  And a new star overhead!

New World, your dreams are white;
  You live in the days to be,
And every hour you know your power,
  And look to the sunlit sea;
Not yours to make the Past a shrine
  Whereat you bend the knee.

New World, you are bright with youth—
An armor that girds your breast;
I see your light through the terrible night,
I feel your glad unrest;
And though the Old World's dreams are sweet,
Your wild desires are best.

III

"WEST IS WEST"; OR WHAT HAS AMERICA TO GIVE?

I HAVE been trying to suggest the outlines of a picture of a world situation, especially in Eastern Asia, a situation which calls for help. If it is true that this appeal comes with peculiar force to America, it becomes pertinent to ask, "What has America to give?" Granted the obligation, are her resources equal to the demand?

Where shall we look for a true picture of our own land? Shall we sit at the feet of one of our Fourth of July orators and listen to his report of the greatness of our country? I have before me the notes of such an address, in which Gladstone and Lord Bryce are quoted to the effect that the Constitution of the United States is "the most wonderful document ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man"; in which the business leadership of the United States is set forth with specifications as to our national wealth and income, the miles of railroad that we have built, the number of telephones and automobiles that we have acquired. I read here of the democracy and the far-reaching character of our educa-

tional system, the versatility of our literature, the enterprise of our press, and our progress in the appreciation of the fine arts. I read of America's superiority in practically every branch of sport and athletics, of the skill of American oratory, of American diplomacy marked by an open-mindedness and an altruism which are entirely lacking in foreign diplomacy. The dominant note in America, asserts the speaker, is a superb moral idealism and a healthy reverence for the sacred things of life. Such words bring us great comfort!

On the other hand, we are living in a day of critics and pessimists within our own borders, not to say of cynics. A recent cultivated American writer says that our people are generally dyspeptic, that multitudes are nomadic, many are vulgar; and that "ideals, noble behavior, intellectual enjoyments, the pleasures of the arts, music, poetry, and the pursuit and practice of the simple life" have been left behind in our devotion to work, politics, and piety! We have, therefore, no civilization, he says, and our nation is dehumanized. Or, again, "Republican institutions are as outworn as chain armor, democracy is the dream of a drunken fool, and our people are corrupt and contented." Some go into more detail and tell us that "America is first—in crime." A committee of the American Bar Association reaffirms Chief Justice Taft's statement that "the

administration of criminal law in the United States is a disgrace to civilization," and points to the number of murders and the comparative safety of criminals. Prominent lawyers protest against abuses of the Federal Department of Justice in wholesale and unwarranted arrests, brutal treatment and even torture of prisoners. Some point to the humiliating revelations of the draft during the World War, reminding us that 47.3 per cent of the white draft showed a mental age of less than thirteen years, and that two-thirds of the entire number included in the draft of white men were below the minimum capacity necessary to make reports or to keep files for army purposes. Only one-third, they infer, of all those millions stood the test of a fair intelligence.

The press, some say, is irresponsible, and where not actually degraded and degrading, is partisan, unreliable, bribed, or muzzled. Our schools and colleges are accused of being controlled in the interests of the ruling classes, a truly liberal education difficult to secure. In many of the states the reading of the Bible is excluded from the public schools. Business morality is claimed to be low beyond precedent. Lynchings (which are reported and studied in other lands, especially in those of the Orient) are still far too common, and other evidences of lack of respect for law are rife. Campaigns of hatred against certain races, colors, and religions are under full headway.

Class and sectional divisions break up the solidarity of our people, and in the midst of commercalism and contention and lawlessness and oppression the church seems sometimes to stand almost helpless, more concerned about correct doctrine than about correct living, with an emphasis on mere opinions which thrusts honesty and justice and brotherly kindness into a secondary place —drowning love in the billows of strife.

So that many are tempted to join in the cutting words of a foreigner who is reported to have called America "a country great in size. A country intolerant of foreigners and extravagantly patriotic. A country needlessly cruel to the weak, vilely unfair to the immigrant, ferociously competitive and wasteful. A country that bullies Mexico, burns negroes, defends child labor, and invented the 'water cure.' In other words, a country that has all the faults of a gigantic youth, and yet, when it slips into its adolescent idealism, forgets that it ever had a fault."

Where is the truth as between such an indictment and the more measured and mild words of Mr. George Santayana, a candid yet appreciative observer:

"There is, in America, a fund of vigor, goodness, and hope such as no nation ever possessed before." In America "all is love of achievement, nothing is unkindness; it is a fearless people, and free from malice."

Should we not first establish a standard of judgment and then decide upon a method of estimate?

A recent writer has suggested that the glory of a nation lies not in the production of vast national wealth, but in the employment of the economic surplus for the highest ends. And he goes on to suggest as the proper and wise purposes of national life these six:

1. *Health.* Pride should stand not in wide territories or bankable assets, but in the subjugation of cancer, hook-worm, tuberculosis, industrial accidents.

2. *Good family life.* This is affected by questions of wages and poverty, by woman and child labor, by the new position and attitude of women in industry, society, and politics, by modern conceptions of marriage and divorce, by the apparent loosening of family ties, and the problem whether, under these changing conditions, the institution of the home is still fundamentally sound, based on romantic love and mutual fidelity.

3. Opportunities for the wholesome and profitable *employment of leisure,* with its related questions of amusements and luxury.

4. The promotion and enjoyment of *beauty,* in nature and in literature, music, and art.

5. The development of natural and social *science,* with its concomitants of invention and organization.

6. The production, through universal *education,* of a state of general enlightenment which will raise the knowledge and the resulting power of the masses to a hitherto unknown stage.

To these six, we may add two or three other items or tests:

1. Is our *prosperity* general? Is fair opportunity offered to all for employment and for a reasonable and comfortable living? Or are we the victims of industrial maladjustment, economic injustice, the inequitable distribution of wealth?

2. Have we the degree of individual *freedom* which is the heritage of Anglo-Saxondom, or are we being Prussianized in our practices? Do we exercise this freedom in subjection to the common good, in reverence for and obedience to the law which is the expression of the common will?

3. Has our *religion* lost its base of Puritan principle and become lax and easy-going? Is our faith vague and our experience likewise indefinite and unsure? Is our religion a vital force governing our social, political, and financial habits, or is it a theory held rigidly apart from life? Are we simply denominationalists or are we bitter sectarians? Are we prophets and priests or mere ecclesiastics?

4. What are we doing with our class, sectional, and *national problems?* Are we subjecting them to the mind of Christ? Are we guilty of pride and provincialism and exclusiveness; or has God set the world within our hearts?

It must be admitted that some of these tests are hard to meet, some of these questions awkward to answer; and the best showing we are likely to make is one of mixed shame and humility. It may be more illuminating and more helpful as we face

the world responsibilities which fate, or God, has imposed upon our country, to ask what the distinguishing watchwords of our day are, after all, and how our country responds to these indications of the chief onward movements of the race.

The one world-wide tendency of our time which at once occurs to every mind is *Democracy.* The age of the common man, if not already here, is fast coming. The watchword of the last generation came to us from physical science, and "evolution" was the key which unlocked many a door to new areas of thought. So to us of this day through social science comes the magic word which sums up within its scope many and varied activities which are changing the face of the earth.

Even before the World War we were startled by the shakings and transformations. Russia had its duma, Persia overthrew its shah, Turkey was groping blindly for a better way, Portugal had established a republic, China elected a president, India was seething with national longings, Germany and England were fettering autocratic or oligarchic hands. Then, in the huge cataclysm, came with a rush the people crowding their way to the throne. How many kings and princes have fallen it boots not to count. Everywhere the common man has become aware of his rights, his power, and grasps eagerly for the scepter.

And what of America? While autocracies elsewhere are being replaced by representative

governments, this republic moves on to wipe out the defects of representative government itself, demanding more immediate, more frequent, more controlling expressions from the great body politic. Government of and for and by the people is not yet fully achieved, but every change is in the direction of its complete attainment. The popular election of senators, the direct primary, the initiative, the referendum, the recall—all are efforts to vindicate the right of the people themselves to rule themselves. Everywhere old governments and parties and institutions are cracking wide open, sometimes tumbling in ruins, because of the heaving beneath the surface of irresistible popular forces.

The same process for a larger recognition of simple human rights is going on likewise in the home, the school, the college, the church. The demand for self-government is heard; the opinion that it is safe to trust the people prevails. Within the church hierarchical privilege is giving way and the laymen are coming to increasing power and leadership. It is a question of individuals rather than of office. The religious democracy which is essentially Christian, and which was vindicated anew in the Protestant Reformation, is now being worked out to its logical conclusion. If the democracy which obtains in religion and in politics has not yet established itself in industry, it is only because the progress of man

is slow, not because it is uncertain. The denial of the right of capital to the sole control of business is no longer an economic heresy. Insistence upon the fact that all who contribute to the success of an enterprise have a right to a share in the management of that enterprise, whether that contribution be money or brains or manual labor, is growingly regarded as a sound industrial principle. What form of co-operation, of profit-sharing, of stock-holding, democracy will finally employ in business, one need not prophesy; but that in some way or in many ways industry and commerce will finally come under the sway of democracy cannot be doubted.

We need not blind our eyes to the weaknesses and faults of democratic government, whether in the church or the state or business. No form is best for all times, all places, all peoples. A monarchical form may be pervaded by a democratic spirit. England, for example, is vastly more democratic than Mexico. Public opinion is by no means infallible; the voice of the people at any particular moment is not invariably the voice of God. Democracy is sometimes envious of its leaders and seeks to level down rather than to level up. It may even be admitted as true, to a degree, in the words of Mr. Lecky, that "some of the strongest democratic tendencies are adverse to liberty." There are

many perils in democracy to established institutions. The new-found freedom of the people is sometimes abused, as notably in poor Russia. Hereditary privileges, privileges of intellect, privileges of wealth, privileges of social standing, privileges of ecclesiastical dignity, are being rudely assailed. In the assertion of the rights of the individual and the rights of reason there has been a depreciation of, if not an actual assault upon, various institutions which have been counted fundamental to religion and civilization. The church, the Sabbath, the Bible, the home, the state, the school, have felt the shock of this assault. The need of the church, the sanctity of the Sabbath, the inspiration of the Scriptures, the pre-eminence of the family, the authority of the state, and the sufficiency of the school, have all been attacked. Doubtless this is due in part to the undue assumptions made on behalf of these institutions by their friends. To claim too much is to invite robbery. To claim that the church is the sole avenue of approach to God, the sole agency of God in the redemption of the world; to claim that the Scriptures have a verbal and uniform and infallible inspiration; to claim that Sabbath observance of the Jewish or Puritan style is a Christian obligation; to claim that the school as it now exists is the full and final answer to the needs of the day; to claim that a public official is above

criticism because he is an official, or a legal decision because it is legal—to put forward such claims is to insure denial and reprisal. In asserting the divine we have too much neglected the human aspect of our sacred institutions. We have not kept ourselves reminded that "the Sabbath was made for man," that the Bible, the home, the state, the church, the school, were made for man and find their end and value in him. But, when all allowance is made, it is true that young liberty in its crudeness has reacted against restraints that are wholesome, against institutions that are venerable not only by age but by truth. We must hope that presently, finding its balance, it will recognize anew the value of its time-honored inheritance, and in the name of man himself will claim and defend what the ages have established.

Let us believe in our great men, our scholars, our poets, our statesmen; let us not wildly denounce the strong, the wise, the rich; but let us also remember the value of the common man and his right to a voice in the world's council. For, after all, democracy is the community equivalent of life eternal, that life of free self-expression and self-surrender, of justice and of brotherhood, which alone in the individual or in the state can be lasting. As one of the truest poets of democracy has written,

Come, clear the way, then, clear the way;
Blind creeds and kings have had their day.
Break the dead branches from the path;
Our hope is in the aftermath—
Our hope is in heroic men
Star-led to build the world again.
To this event the ages ran:
Make way for brotherhood—make way for man.

Has not America something in democracy to give to the East?

Another of the great words of our day is *Emancipation.* It might apply to the deliverance from many forms of slavery, intellectual or social; but I use it with special reference to womanhood. Emancipation is the right word applied to a process which has been going on through many centuries.

In the home woman has been slowly raised from the position of plaything and servant to that of wife and comrade, with equal, though diverse, functions in the life of the family. In the church woman has been raised from the posture of a passive worshiper, not allowed even to speak in a religious congregation, until she has reached a large and independent and successful development of church and philanthropic work, has become a member of governing bodies like General Conferences, and in more than one Christian denomination is allowed not merely to form the ma-

jority in the pew, but also to occupy the pulpit. In society woman has been raised from that low legal status which made the great lawyer Blackstone pronounce her "civilly dead" until she is recognized not merely as the junior and silent partner of some "civilly alive" man, but as a free personality with rights well established before the law. In the school woman has been raised from the place of an excluded or tolerated student to the full enjoyment of the highest opportunities offered by the universities of the world. And it has been found to the surprise of many that, so far from her womanly character being destroyed in the process and herself unfitted for domestic life, her womanliness has been enriched, her home life broadened and sweetened by the intellectual advantages which have so recently been offered her. In business occupations woman has been admitted not only to the fields and the mills and the stores, but to the offices and to the so-called higher and learned professions. And in politics, yes—even in politics, the emancipation of woman proceeds apace. National committees of great political parties seek women members; in the nominating convention of one party almost every prominent candidate for president has his nomination seconded by a woman. I do not forget how slowly some of us conservatives submit to the inevitable, how we have contended that when once women were allowed to vote, they would be less

helpful mothers and less pleasant wives. I do not forget that the state is not the only nor the most important molding institution of society, and that one may contend that the functions of man and woman in the state are permanently to be divided without thereby implying anything in derogation of woman. Yet, on the other hand, I remember that the governing class tends always and everywhere to become more and more inclusive. Disqualification from the suffrage because of race, religion, lack of property, lack of education, while strongly supported, slowly yields, and disqualification on the ground of sex has also given way, because the very stars in their courses fight against it. Even foolish friends cannot reverse a mighty historic tendency. Some opponents with arguments, some with ridicule, some with mistaken violence, would repeat the comedy of King Canute upon the seashore; but even blunders and crimes will not check the flow of the moving tide. Has not womanhood in America been so exalted as to offer a precept and an example to the world?

Another of the key words which open for us the understanding of our age is *Socialization.* It applies to politics. The object to be aimed at in government is more and more clearly emerging into view. The things which all progressive parties and administrations must seek are the health, the welfare, the industrial rights of the people. A new large party recently sprang up whose plat-

form consisted almost exclusively not of political or of merely economic issues, but of vital questions of social reform and betterment.

The church has always been powerfully influenced by the social impulse. Religion, in reality, has always been social. A solitary Christian, as John Wesley long ago asserted, is an unthinkable thing. But it has happened in our day that, side by side with a new spiritual emphasis and a new ardor for the great evangelistic undertakings of the church, there has arisen a new social conscience and a new social ministry. The church has to-day a broader, a saner, and a truer theology than a generation ago, partly because it is less mechanical and more vital; it is less theoretical and more practical; it is less of the study and more of the street. The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America not many years since listened to a great document from its Commission on the Church and Social Service in which the church identified "these little ones," "these brethren" of Christ (the attitude toward whom was said by Christ Himself to be a test of character and of destiny) as the killed and injured in industrial accidents, the children bound down to employment in factories, mill-hands over-worked and under-paid. And there was adopted by this Federal Council, representing its many millions of adherents, a platform of sixteen planks, each one of which pointed out the duty of the church to

reorganize and transfigure human society as well as to rescue human persons one by one. The mission of the gospel will never be fulfilled when individuals, no matter how numerous, have been snatched out of a corrupt order and set off in an unworldly community by themselves; but only when men and women, transformed by the grace of Christ, shall have cleansed and sweetened that corrupt order in which they find themselves, shall have conquered the world, not by fleeing from it but by staying in it and making a new world corresponding to the new heaven of righteousness and peace. In the practical application of theory to life, has not America something to enrich the existence of the mystic and contemplative East?

The fourth word of the present time is *Conservation.* We are hearing much of the conservation of natural resources, of forests, of waterpower, of mineral wealth, of beauty; much of scientific agriculture to make the most of the opportunities which nature affords; and the whole movement is one of common sense and patriotism. But natural resources, after all, are valuable only because of their relation to man. "The life is more than meat." Greater than the conservation of natural resources is the conservation of human resources; and the effort to make life safer, healthier, more powerful, is one whose importance cannot be measured. Physical science is making its rich contribution to human convenience and

comfort. The motor car and the aeroplane, the X-ray and the radiophone, the investigation into the causes of disease, the work of prevention and sanitation, so notable in Cuba and at the Panama Canal—all are the outcome of a noble struggle for that mastery of nature in the service of humanity to which man was early appointed. Pure food is being assured; infant mortality reduced; blindness combated; tuberculosis, cancer, impurity, alcoholism, all recognized as foes and conquerable foes. Children are being studied and guarded as never before, their young energies directed into the channels of appropriate study and timely play. Labor is being made more efficient; scientific management brings economy of effort with maximum of result. Hours of labor are being reduced by law or by agreement, wages steadied by organization or by legislation. And, while prevention and preservation are counted much wiser than rescue, there are juvenile courts for the wandering, old age pensions for the broken, insurance benefits for the sick and unemployed, compensations for the victims of industrial accident. And the meaning of it all is a higher value upon life, a concern for the weak and unfortunate and oppressed—the conservation, physical as well as spiritual, of those for whom Christ died. To these lands of the Orient, less sensitive to human suffering and death, less careful of the individual and

more concerned with the mass, America has something to impart.

Another word which is far from new, but just as far from outworn, is *Education.* It would be strange, while looking over the significant movements of the age, to ignore this. I do not by any means refer simply to the maintenance of our church schools, though these are a most important sign and instrument of Christianized education. The church has led and still leads the way in the higher education of our land. The teacher who gives some segment of his life to the schools and colleges through which the church seeks to serve the world, the benefactor who by his gift makes possible the enlargement and strengthening of that work, these have good cause for self-congratulation that they are putting their lives where they shall count powerfully for the world's uplift. But it should not be forgotten that in some broader sense the Christian spirit is permeating all education: Christian, because the education of the whole man, physical, intellectual, moral, and religious is demanded by our day; Christian, because of the increasing sense of responsibility, the individual interest and attention bestowed upon students. Education thus becomes part of the process of salvation, saving from ignorance, superstition, fear, partisanship, bigotry. And the work of education, ancient in its beginnings, is

still modern in its development and mighty in its usefulness. This liberal and fundamental conception of education which America growingly accepts, is the very thought which the Far East needs to guide its intellectual eagerness.

One other word should yet be given, *Unification.* The federation and harmony of dissevered forces, whether these forces be ecclesiastical or political, is one of the signs of our times. To secure a unity of the spirit between churches, between industrial classes, between races—this is a high undertaking. There are still those who breathe war and talk war. Lovers of blood and lovers of money still scheme to rouse a martial spirit and to hurry antagonists upon the field of battle. But this is not the mind of the people. This was not the aim of our boys who lie yonder in France and who went to their death crying, as they thought of the ravages of war, "Never again!" They fought and died to end war. Whether or not the League of Nations in its present form is to be accepted, America demands and God demands some league of the nations to secure justice and peace. The world must more and more become one.

And if one asks why this increasing sense of essential oneness, why this growth of world brotherhood, he may yield due praise to travel, which has found both the north and the south poles; and to sport, which leads us into generous rivalry and new acquaintanceship; and to com-

merce, which causes the blood to flow through the arteries that join nation to nation; and to labor, which stands on both sides the sea for peace; but he must not forget that the influence of religion is beyond all. The churches themselves are becoming one. Combination and co-operation are the order of the hour. The World's Student Federation, the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations, the Anti-Saloon League, the Federal Council, the Sunday School enterprise, the common task of social service, the foreign missionary endeavor, and a dozen more, all tend to wipe out surface differences and to reveal underlying unities. The church has caught the vision of Christ's universal dominion, and the spirit of religion, working through trade and education and government as well as through the church, hastens on the day

> Till the war-drum throbb'd no longer, and the battle-flags were furl'd
> In the Parliament of man, the Federation of the world.

Would we uplift the Orient? Our money must be given, our prayers must be given, our children must be given, but we must also give ourselves. If we can make the church what it ought to be, in unity, in catholicity, in sincerity, and in passion, so that we might indeed "worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness"; if we can make this country what it ought to be—if we can cause to prevail

honor and generosity in business and in politics, purity in home and society, dignity in labor, justice in industry, progressiveness in ideals; if we can bring in a new era of opportunity, intelligence, freedom, order, and brotherhood, so as to reflect in some faint degree what Jesus Christ can really accomplish with a nation surrendered to His will; then we may cancel the stinging reproach—"It might be possible for the nations to believe in Christianity if it were not for Christendom"—then may we preach illustrated sermons on the power of the Gospel which shall subdue the heart of the East and speed the Kingdom on its way!

IV

CAN "THE TWAIN" "MEET?" THE PRESENT

We have been considering some of the things that ought to be done touching the inner life of our own land, which indirectly might be helpful to lands beyond the seas. I wish to follow this line of thought a little farther by speaking now of what we ought to do, what we may do, what we must do, in our direct dealings with other peoples than our own.

At the recent Student Volunteer Convention at Indianapolis, it was significant that the discussion groups concentrated their attention on international and interracial problems more than on problems of evangelism, strictly so called. In that they were striking close to the heart of things. One may almost say that the final test of America's democracy and America's religion will be found in her attainment of a genuinely international mind.

It is perfectly easy, and not uncommon, to sneer at the internationalist. A popular verse writer, who was comparing the internationalist to the Gulf Stream which sets out with a great am-

bition to warm the whole cold ocean, pictures his failure thus:

> Though maybe I melted an iceberg or two,
> I lost my identity—vanished from view.

But the analogy breaks down at two points. The writer for one thing forgot the warmth and the moisture and the fruitfulness which the Gulf Stream brings to regions on the far side of the waste of waters; and for the other he forgot that any influence losing its identity in a great cause is acting according to a divine law, "Except a grain of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone."

I am not concerned over the losses and dangers of internationalism so much as I am concerned lest America fail to be really international. A foreigner a little while back said that America is not fitted to enter the League of Nations because "America as yet has no international mind"; and while the indictment is perhaps oversweeping, one may not deny a measure of truth to the statement. The Great War did something to expand us mentally, to enlarge our intellectual horizon; but still how much we have of provincialism disporting itself with the proud boast that it is one hundred per cent Americanism! How much of narrowness still disfigures our thought!

True internationalism is not opposed to patriotism. He would be a poor apology for a man

who did not love his own wife best, his own children more deeply than other children. But the family circle ought to teach a human benevolence that will extend far beyond the family circle itself, or its purpose as God's training-school of love will have been in that particular defeated. I love my country more than I love any other country. I was never so proud of being an American, never so glad to be an American, as in the years I have been living in the Orient. But we must not forget those priceless words of Edith Cavell, as she stood face to face with a martyr's death—"Patriotism is not enough." In that solemn hour she rose high enough to look beyond the boundaries of her own country; the world came into her view: "Patriotism is not enough." Internationalism is not against patriotism, but it is against a narrow nationalism, it is against a nationalism which implies that because I love my country best, therefore I am to seek to exalt my country by hatred or contempt for some other country. It is against racial intolerance and that smug and superior indifference which goes so far as to make us petty.

The international mind involves an intelligent sympathy with the problems of other countries. Thinking of the field particularly in view, the truly international mind should cause us to have an intelligent sympathy with China's gigantic strug-

gles, an intelligent sympathy with Korea's aspirations, an intelligent sympathy with Japan's problems and perplexities and progress. It involves a spirit of brotherhood which crosses racial and national lines, a spirit which America seemed to have in a very high degree in some of our earlier days. I was reminded of this in an interview with a group of Japanese gentlemen, the leader of which was one whose name is not unknown in this country—Viscount Shibusawa—sometimes called "the grand old man of Japan," or "the Pierpont Morgan of Japan." He was telling his experiences in international affairs after the rather rude opening of Japan to modern life under the leadership of Commodore Perry. He, like many another Japanese, was prejudiced against this foreign inrush and was standing for things distinctively Oriental, until, coming into close contact with America and Americans, he was so impressed by the understanding and good-will displayed that he became enthusiastically pro-American, and in that way his heart was opened to the whole Western world. When he told me that, I thought of the words a well-known Japanese banker had spoken in my hearing a few days before. This man was among those who had traveled in America and had become ardent admirers of that land. He told how he and many of his friends had taken so cordial an attitude toward the Western republic that on their return to Japan

they were subjected to criticism and even ridicule because of their admiration for America. "Yet," he said, "such was our mind." "But within the last few years"—he added, and shrugged his shoulders. I knew what he meant. Has a new spirit entered our beloved country? Was our old friendliness for other peoples only the outcome of self-content, or ignorance? Was our land so vast and self-contained, was our home market so ample that, with a few exceptions, we cared little for foreign commerce; and merely because we were not competitors of others could afford to tolerate them, and even allow ourselves the luxury of liking and helping them? Were the ideals of national unselfishness which we proclaimed simply the result of national isolation, the easy virtue of a by-stander who watches the struggles of others with an impartial eye because they do not touch his own interests? But now, when we are eager for foreign markets and almost against our will have come inevitably and actively into the arena of the world's strife, are our ideals to fade? Are we to become "little Americans," trying to shrink back into the shell which we have outgrown, calling everything "foreign" which is not American, and disclaiming responsibility for it all? Nay, nay, we must have the international mind. "Above all nations is humanity." America first, but not America last or America only! "Localism," it has well been said, "is the begin-

ning of all social cohesion, but it cannot be regarded as the American ideal, first, because it is not peculiarly American, and, second, because it is not peculiarly ideal!"

True! Genuine Americanism is big Americanism. With all the affection which springs from gratitude to our own land, with all the love which grows from intimate knowledge, with all the hope which arises from the possession of American power and American ideals, the real one hundred per cent American is more than an American, he is a citizen of the world; he is an internationalist. He is a man, and nothing which concerns man is alien to him! He can rise above national and racial intolerance into the purer air of human brotherhood.

Ah, how we need to pray the prayer that Mornay Williams wrote:

O God, who hast made man in Thine own likeness, and who dost love all whom Thou hast made, suffer us not because of difference in color or condition to separate ourselves one from another, and thereby from Thee; but teach us the unity of Thy family and the universality of Thy love. As Thy Son, our Savior, was born of an Hebrew mother and ministered first to His brethren of the house of Israel, but rejoiced in the faith of a Syro-Phœnician woman and of a Roman soldier, and suffered His cross to be carried by a man of Africa; teach us, also, while loving and serving our own, to enter into the communion of the whole human family;

and forbid that from pride of birth and hardness of heart we should despise any for whom Christ died, or injure any in whom He lives. Amen.

Can the American people join in that prayer? Can they yield themselves to that spirit? By that they will be judged.

By all ye will or whisper, by all ye leave or do,
The silent, sullen peoples will judge your God, and you.

What they do in Cuba and Hayti, in Mexico and in the Philippines, in Georgia and in California, will speak so loudly to the ears of the Orient as to drown the resolutions of Congress and even the speeches of Presidents. By their deeds and their thoughts to other races, not only will the American people themselves be judged, but Christianity will be judged.

For they are more than Americans, more than mere humans; they are supposed Christians, and having been taught in the school of Christ they have something of His spirit of universal goodwill. He died "not for the nation only, but that He might also gather into one the children of God that are scattered abroad." His horizon was bounded not by the hills, but by the sky. Within the circle of His benevolence He included all the sons of men—of all times and all climes, of all colors and all characters. And the only tolerable ideal for a nation called Christian must be that

its national and international affairs shall be conducted on the principles of Jesus Christ.

Our greatest Americans, from Washington to Wilson, have held that the same relations should prevail between states as between individual citizens; that just as between gentlemen courtesy, patience, comprehension, unselfishness are due, so between nations. The law of God, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," is not only personal but national; and questions like immigration and the tariff are not to be settled on the basis of national selfishness if they are to be settled rightly.

I grant that this is not a common view. Examples to the contrary may be picked almost at random. For instance, a prominent newspaper, speaking of a proposed mediation between certain clashing foreign states, says: "This country has no business undertaking to settle their quarrels or define their boundaries. If because of their nature the Ruler of the Universe has not yet established peace among them, what reason has the Government of the United States, or the President of the United States, to imagine that he can do it?" The Commissioner General of Immigration was applauded when he declared, as reported, that "immigration laws were no longer to be designed for the benefit of the immigrant, but in their making the thought would be 'America first';" and we know what that generally means.

A popular periodical asserts, "Our immigration laws should be written in America by Americans and for Americans. To-day we are the only nation in the world that does not discriminate—that does not place the good of its own country and its own nationals above that of any other." Even more explicit is the proclamation of certain organizations in California: "The solution reached (on immigration) should be determined by the effect it may have upon American citizenship, *regardless of its effect upon other nations or peoples.*" I submit that that is paganism and not Christianity; it is barbarism and not civilization! The American ideal is essentially the Christian ideal, and this kind of talk not only falls short of the Christian standard, but it is not true to the highest traditions of America. Until we recognize frankly and fully the law of Christ as binding in our public acts, we have nothing but a will-o'-the-wisp to guide us, and our pathway will lead into the swamps.

I want to apply that principle to our treatment of foreigners within our own borders, especially the Orientals. As early as 1790 our fathers, acting on the restricted knowledge of their day, enacted a law limiting naturalization to whites, a privilege extended after the Civil War to include also blacks, and supposedly the colors between. But this law was supplemented by one passed as recently as 1882, which specifically provided

that no Chinese might be naturalized.[1] This latter provision, which would exclude from American citizenship all Chinese entering this country, was apparently made on the ground that the Orientals were not assimilable. (In approaching this question, one should note the distinction between *assimilation* and *amalgamation.* Few would plead for amalgamation—intermarriage and mingling of blood—but the question of assimilation is merely the question of the possibility of those who are of other races accommodating themselves to American standards and American ideals and becoming helpful members of American communities. What is asked is not racial mixture but simply racial tolerance.) Now, if any foreigners are to be admitted to our country, either they must be assimilated, that is, taken into the mass of our citizenship so that there shall be no sharp line of division in rights and opportunities and culture, or they must be colonized —remain as essentially foreign communities although dwelling on American soil. The latter plan, although it is precisely what is now happening in some sections, is, from the standpoint not only of America but of the world, obviously undesirable. I am willing to go so far as to say that we have no room in this country for any but

[1] In later years Federal departmental instructions and court decisions have interpreted the statute as excluding from the privilege of naturalization *all except* whites and blacks.

Americans; that every man who expects to become a permanent resident should become also an American. But if that be true, we must assimilate him since we have not excluded him. Having decided (however falsely, as it seems to me) that certain Orientals at least were not assimilable, our country proceeded to pass a Chinese exclusion Act so that no laborers could be admitted to this country at all. For lack of cheap Oriental labor, California then began to call aloud for Japanese workmen for the railroads and the farms; but with the increase of the number of Japanese in the state, many soon became alarmed. This fear of a surplus and inconvenient Japanese population led to the Gentlemen's Agreement in 1908, intended to restrict Japanese immigration to the point of exclusion. But even with these restrictions, California and its neighbors have not been satisfied. They have claimed that there is an undue increase in the number of resident Japanese, and that the Gentlemen's Agreement has been evaded; and, in order to protect interests which they thought endangered, they have been enacting land laws to the end that aliens not eligible to citizenship shall not be allowed to own land—corporations in which aliens own the majority of the stock shall not be allowed to own land; no such alien or corporation shall be allowed to lease land for more than a brief period; nor shall any alien make a crop contract with a land-owner for a di-

vision of crops in return for his labor. These laws have finally been declared constitutional by the Supreme Court, and are not without embarrassment to white California land-owners as well as to Japanese. They have been followed by the "Japanese Exclusion Clause" of the new Immigration Bill, and by several resolutions presented to Congress, though not yet passed, proposing to amend the Constitution in such fashion that American-born children of aliens who are themselves ineligible to citizenship shall not acquire citizenship by birth, as has been true up to this time. The Jones Resolution goes to the extreme of proposing that such amendment shall be retroactive, so that even children of aliens not themselves eligible to citizenship who have already acquired citizenship by birth on American soil, shall have that citizenship taken from them!

It may be enlightening to know something of the sentiments back of these proposals. Certain organizations have banded themselves together to further such legislation, declaring that they will put their combined strength in Congressional elections against any man opposing their policies. Some of these groups have expressed a determination by legal means to make conditions of living unbearable for the Orientals on the Pacific Coast. Some leaders in Christian institutions are saying that they dislike the Oriental, or specifically the Japanese, to such an extent that they

have no interest in vindicating his supposed rights. An architect in California, a man of education and travel, from whom one would expect world views, asserted bluntly that "these national antagonisms are fundamentally right." A Western lawyer said, "I don't want to give justice to the Japanese in America, for that would be to admit that they are our equals. . . . I don't believe in trying to Christianize these Orientals. Christianity is the final religion, but not for the Asiatic." A lawyer sworn to the cause of justice permits his mental integrity to be undermined by race prejudice, and a believer in Christianity proposes to deny to the Asiatics the religion founded by an Asiatic Jew! Can it be true, as I was told, that a music teacher in the city of Los Angeles does not dare to have her Japanese pupils appear in a public recital, and that even the fact that she has Japanese pupils must be kept secret from her Christian patrons, lest she lose their patronage? Is it true that a Japanese boy was elected president of the student body of a Junior High School by the votes of 900 of the 1,300 members of the student body, only to have the parents protest so violently that it became necessary to disband the student organization for the period during which this lad was to serve? If signs are put upon the streets, "Japs get out! This is a white man's neighborhood!" and if these are photographed and the pictures sent back to Japan, what is the

effect on the Japanese mind concerning the brotherly professions of Christianity and of America? In Los Angeles we Methodists have even been prevented by the City Council from putting up a church for the Japanese in a certain neighborhood. Popular sentiment says, "We let them come and mow our lawns; but when it comes to building a church, we will not have them." And this not merely to men born in Japan who do not speak our language, but to those who have been born in America, who are American citizens by birth, who have received American education, who have contributed to our patriotic funds, and some of whom have served in our armies; this to children who cry, "I am not a Japanese, I am American"; this to a young man who says, "The most important thing of all is to be true and loyal and faithful to the land of lands, my own United States!" Do you wonder that there should be irritation in Japan at such evidence of unfairness, unkindness, racial intolerance? The gains in international amity registered after the Washington Conference and the marvelous help extended to Japan by the American people following the great earthquake of 1923, cannot prevent a feeling of grief and bewilderment after more recent happenings. Expectations which seem reasonable are disappointed. The best Japanese feeling is voiced in a letter from which I may quote:

Nothing touched my grateful heart more forcibly in all my life than the phenomenal outburst of sympathy throughout the length and breadth of the United States for stricken Japan in September last. The remarkable thing is that it was so spontaneous, so widespread, so prompt and so generous in magnitude. I need not say that it affected the hearts of my fellow-countrymen in the same way. I am quite safe in saying that nothing has done more to draw the two peoples more intimately together.

It is my fervent prayer that the same spirit of brotherly love that prompted the American people in extending to us in our moment of distress their hands of sympathy and in showering upon us gifts and assistance in a most generous way may also guide them in the task of removing the only remaining impediment in the way of perfect understanding between America and Japan. The Washington Conference succeeded in clearing away much of the clouds of doubt and suspicion that darkened the political horizon on the Pacific. It did wonders in this respect. But there is a matter which that Conference has left unsolved, and that is the status of the Japanese lawfully admitted into the United States and pursuing honest means of livelihood. That is the only speck of cloud on the otherwise bright and hopeful horizon between the two countries. I fondly trust that, when the matter is squarely brought before them, their innate sense of fairness will make the Americans see their way clear in settling this last of the outstanding questions between the two nations.[1]

[1] Viscount Shibusawa.

I am not blind to the difficulties of our whole immigration question, with its complicated social and economic factors. But, while it is always easier for an outsider to settle a problem than for those who are face to face with it in daily contacts, I am willing personally to stand on this platform:

1. I believe, for the present at least, in the close restriction of immigration. While America should still "spell opportunity," and our old tradition of offering an asylum to the oppressed of every land should not be forgotten or despised, we must guard carefully our own national heritage. Self-preservation, while not the first law of nature in importance, has yet a legitimate place in individual and national life. To make the United States of the largest possible service to the rest of mankind, we ought to maintain our standards—economic, social, educational, moral, religious. An unrestrained flood of immigration would tend to sweep these away and thus injure all. For the world's sake as well as our own, we do well to keep the barriers at a reasonable height and admit only such immigrants as we can assimilate.[2]

2. These restrictions ought to apply to all foreign nations alike. Discrimination is an offense against international comity. It produces humiliation or irritation, which interferes with mutual good-will. Speaking par-

[2] By *assimilation* I do not mean to imply racial mixture by intermarriage, reducing all the bright national hues to a mongrelized grayness; but merely that process of making genuine American citizens which is referred to more specifically under 4.

ticularly of the Asiatic nations, what they ask is not liberty to send large numbers of people to our shores but simply equal treatment with the nations of Europe, Australia, Africa. They resent the apparent implication of our present treatment, that their nationals are inferior to those coming from all other countries. We could not wish that this should be otherwise. We should think less of them if they did not have this decent self-respect, this proper national pride. It is true that even the more backward peoples of southern and eastern Europe have a social background much more like our own than the Orientals; but judged by the tests of industry, thrift, obedience to law, desire for education, readiness to adopt American ways, there appears no reason why the Orientals may not fairly be assimilated [3] into our national life. A door equally open toward all nations, fair treatment for every man, not on the basis of race or color but on the basis of individual worth, should be our watchword.

3. With all due recognition of the obstinacy and complexity of the problems involved, I believe an effort should be made by the Federal Government to bring about a wiser and more scientific distribution and location of immigrants who have been admitted. The most awkward question regarding these foreign populations with which we are called upon to deal is the presence in large undigested masses of aliens or recently naturalized citizens who preserve a foreign atmosphere and it may be a foreign language—like some German and Scandinavian rural communities in the Middle West, the Japanese in California, the Mexicans in the southwest, the

[3] See note, p. 82.

Jews in several large cities of the East. If these groups could by any device be scattered so that the component parts might be placed where they are most needed and where they could be most quickly absorbed into the common life, the worst of our troubles in this matter would disappear.

4. I believe in the admission to citizenship of no alien (and perhaps this ought to be extended also to the native-born) without training and testing in the language, history, and ideals of the American people. There should be a system of registration and supervision, supplemented by a thorough education in "Americanism," before any foreign-born resident should have the privileges and responsibilities of full citizenship. He should be freed from allegiance to any foreign power and give adequate evidence of loyalty, intelligence, and morality, before receiving the right to participate in the government of this country.

5. Under these conditions I believe that all foreigners who are admitted to permanent residence within our borders should be eligible to citizenship. None should be made citizens unless individually qualified; none should be barred because of anything but individual defects. To protest against the presence in our land of alien groups or blocs, yet at the same time to make it impossible for these groups to become really American in feeling and activity, is not statesmanship but folly. That the Japanese—to take an outstanding illustration—are capable of becoming loyal and useful American citizens has been demonstrated by the attitude of Japanese children born here and by the record made by Japanese in this country

during the Great War, as well as by the situation in Hawaii. To hold out citizenship as a goal, yet firmly to insist upon the qualifications laid down for its attainment, surely this is at once to conciliate, to encourage, and to include those who as permanent aliens might be a danger to our institutions.

Whatever one's opinions may be regarding such a program, at least this is true—our treatment of foreigners in this country has not been Christian. There is somewhere a Christian solution for the Oriental problem in the United States, and it must be found and put into effect by the united efforts of right-minded citizens. The church of Jesus Christ especially has much at stake in this matter; for unless we can show more of the Christian spirit in our treatment of aliens, we might almost as well withdraw our missionaries from the Orient. They will not assentingly listen to the preaching of our Christ in theory if our country denies our Christ in practice.

The principles of Christianity in international relationships must further be applied as against imperialism, whether political or economic—a theme on which I may barely touch. We Americans are heartily convinced that our spirit and aims are thoroughly non-imperialistic, that no nation can truthfully complain of American aggression; our only trouble is that the peoples to the west and the south of us do not seem to be

quite so sure of this as we ourselves are! They have watched at least with acute interest the occupation of this continent—our spread to Texas, the Pacific Coast, Alaska, and our extension to Hawaii and the Philippines. They have noted somewhat carefully, if not apprehensively, our dealings with Hayti and Porto Rico and Panama, and in general, the republics of Central and South America. They have read books like Professor Powers' "America among the Nations," with its uncomfortable if not disturbing conclusions. They may grant our sincerity in all that we say; their only doubt is as to whether our national policies always have matched and always will match our words. They listen while we proclaim that the Philippines are ours "not to subjugate but to emancipate, not to rule in the power of might but to take to that distant people the principles of liberty, of freedom of conscience, and of opportunity which are enjoyed by the people of the United States." These are noble words. But everybody will remember that included in this "freedom of opportunity" is the right to self-government, and that while our statesmen have made encouraging declarations and our Congress has passed a resolution of promise, the decisive word is always "Not yet!" I am not impugning our Philippine policy; I am simply pointing out that it is quite easy for those who do not know the American mind from within not to be so en-

thusiastically convinced of our political virtue and unselfishness as we ourselves are.

So with other matters of national procedure in the Orient. I have assured Japanese gentlemen that all the United States wanted in the Far East was the political security of China and Siberia and the commercial advantages of a genuinely "open door." Our history in the Far East on the whole bears out this interpretation, as Mr. Tyler Dennett has shown. American policy may not invariably have been one of philanthropy and altruism, but it has represented an honest endeavor to co-operate with other nations and an honest desire for the welfare and progress of the native peoples, coupled with an equally honest search for equal opportunities with all other nations, especially for commercial opportunity. Yet there has been suspicion in the Orient of the ulterior purposes of America, a suspicion happily diminished if not wholly removed by the statesmanlike Washington Conference on the Limitation of Armaments, which marked nothing less than a turning-point in international dealings. The words of President Harding at its opening struck a keynote for a new and divine song of peace:

> The United States welcomes you with unselfish hands. We harbor no fears; we have no sordid ends to serve; we suspect no enemy; we contemplate or apprehend no conquest. Content with what we have, we ask nothing that is another's. We only wish to do with you that

finer, nobler thing which no nation can do alone. We wish to sit with you at the table of international understanding and good-will.

The later attitude of our Government, of persistent national isolation or at least of separation from the most significant international movement in current history, is not wholly reassuring. Yet President Coolidge shows kinship with President Harding:

We attend to our own affairs, conserve our own strength, and protect the interests of our own citizens; but we recognize thoroughly our obligation to help others, reserving to the decision of our own judgment the time, the place, and the method. We realize the common bond of humanity. We know the inescapable law of service. . . . Our foreign policy has always been guided by two principles. The one is the avoidance of permanent political alliances which would sacrifice our proper independence. The other is the peaceful settlement of controversies between nations.

This leads naturally to one other aspect of this whole problem affecting our political and missionary relations with the rest of the world. Mohammed Ali, the leader of the Nationalist Moslems of India, not long before he became a prisoner was talking with a Christian bishop who was his friend. "I have nothing against missionaries," he said. "I have nothing against Christian preaching. It is only the 'Amen' to which I

object!" "And what do you mean by the 'Amen?' " he was asked. "Why, I mean the gunboat that points its cannon ashore while the missionary is preaching, and at the end says, 'Boom —Amen!' "

After we have made it clear beyond all possible doubt that our national purposes are not imperialistic, we must also establish our willingness not merely to abstain from plunder, not only positively, actively to assume our share—our large share—of the world's general burden, but especially to help organize the world's peace.

Is this impossible? Mr. Edison once remarked, "The impossible is merely that which has not yet been done."

The abolition of war is something which must be done. Mr. Secretary Hughes does not help much by asserting that "war is not an abnormality . . . not the mere play of brute force . . . but the expression of the insistent human will, inflexible in its purpose," and by pointing out the heroism and even the compassion of high-minded soldiers. Those do not take us far who provide for future wars by recounting how our fathers were ready to die for great causes and how we, their sons, will also always be ready so to die. War is not merely a question of being ready to die, but more of being ready to make somebody else die—to kill the man who opposes our "inflexible will," on the double assumption that we

are certainly right and that the only way at present available to prove that we are right is to kill the man who thinks we are wrong! War means that, lacking a method for the judicial settlement of a dispute in a given case, it is better to appeal to the arbitrament of arms than to lose the case. Surely Dr. Frederick W. Norwood speaks more sanely: "A civilization which has nothing better to do with its bravest and brainiest than to fling them in conflicting waves against men of equal worth in other nations is a civilization which is judged—not in those places where men talk and write unceasingly their shallow philosophies and policies, but where the red poppies grow by the innumerable graves of Humanity's dead—and by *them* our civilization is unanswerably judged." Opie Read may be right in saying, "War destroys art, makes masterpieces of literature dull, drowns heart-music with its screaming fifes; but it brings out the sublimity of Job and haloes anew the Cross of Calvary." But for the Christian it brings also this question: Under the same circumstances would Jesus Christ, the Jewish patriot, the lover and Savior of mankind, don a uniform and go out to kill His enemies? Can we imagine our Christ in khaki?

Whatever the answer to this question, and whatever the conception of individual American Christians as to the right course to follow in some ultimate crisis, we are united in this: *War must end,*

and America is the one country best situated to lead the way. Whether the Bok plan be perfect or even the best practicable plan for the present is not the question. The Church must lift up its voice in new and determined tones against war, against preparations for war, against confidence in war, against recognition of war as a lawful activity in these days of the higher life. Editors, admirals, generals, Secretaries of War, even clergymen, speak in toleration of this anachronism, this absurdity, this enormity—and the heathen world stands by to watch and to judge whether or not we really believe in Christ and His way of life. When a member of the new Labor Government stated that if peace was wanted, not war but peace must be prepared for; and went on to say that we needed to lift the lid from "the sarcophagus of the New Testament," in which the Great Reformer had prescribed the principles of national defense, a British general exclaimed in the House of Commons, "If the Empire is to be defended by Sermons on the Mount, God help us!" He did not seem to suppose it possible that if a nation dared to trust itself to the Sermon on the Mount, God *would* help them.

Such protesting and discordant voices belong to an earlier and a more evil day. A new possibility of universal and enduring peace has flashed before the weary eyes of men. If we wish to convince the Orient that the civilization of the West,

so dependent upon the religion of Jesus Christ, is a higher civilization, to be coveted by the followers of Confucius and Buddha, we must bring to pass, and that right soon, the dream of poets and prophets and make the angels' song into history.

My longing has been that this dear land might be a mediator between warring and suspicious nations, a leader of timid peoples afraid to trust themselves to the paths of peace. We have tried to show ourselves friends of the world when it cost us nothing and also when it cost us something. May not our land in even some more potent sense become, in President Harding's words, "not only an inspiration and example, but the highest agency of strengthening good-will and promoting accord" on all the continents? In the innumerable conflicts of interest all about us, what need there is of a strong, calm, and friendly voice! "Blessed are the peacemakers; for they shall be called sons of God."

But to play such a part America must purge herself of prejudices, old and new, and of all small and selfish motives. She must dedicate herself afresh and more deeply to the service of humanity. She must make herself one with her sister nations, bear the responsibilities which belong to strength, and pass a self-denying ordinance renouncing all false ambition, all narrow nationalism. In a word, she must stand among

the peoples as Christ stood among the people, saying, "I am in the midst of you as he that serveth." Along this pathway lies the permanent glory of our land!

V

"THAT ONE FACE"

America's obligation to the Orient includes the obligation to be, in her own inner life, what she ought to be. What she *is* speaks and will speak "so loudly," to use Emerson's phrase, that men will not "hear what she says." America is called, not merely for the sake of her own children but for the sake of all the children of men, to rise to loftier heights of moral achievement. Our Lord Himself said, "For their sakes I sanctify myself," and the social motive for goodness is always most appealing, noblest, most effective.

But when America has done these things that relate to her inner life, when she has achieved the truly international mind and expressed it in her treatment of foreigners within her borders and of other nations without her borders, still she has not discharged the full obligation of her divine destiny. She must communicate to others the secret of her own happiness and power; she must help them to a new philosophy of history; she must show God working, revealing, commanding; she must convince them that God in Christ is concerned with human affairs and that all domestic

and foreign problems for America, for the Orient, for the world, are to find their explanation in His will and His mysterious way with men.

As a matter of fact, Christianity itself is responsible very largely for the existence and for the recognition of these international problems. I know that our religion has had many heavy burdens laid upon its shoulders. We were told a few years ago that Christianity was responsible for the labor problem, and there was a sense in which that was unquestionably true. Who ever heard of any agitation in darkest Africa over hours, or wages, or conditions of work? The Hottentots might be industrially oppressed, but when was there a strike? Only where Christianity has lifted man into his proper place of dignity as a son of God, only where Christianity has exalted human worth and human rights, is there any labor problem at all. So with these international problems. The same circumstances of conflict between national interests have existed from very early times, but who has heard of an "international problem" in pre-Christian days? Persia might overrun Greece at her pleasure—no conference was called about it. War was the natural and normal condition of human society. He who was able might conquer and enslave and ravish. Respect for national rights, regard for weaker peoples—where were they? Nay, rather, was followed "the good old plan

That he should take who's able to,
And he should keep who can."

There was no problem at all except a problem on the part of the strong how to get power over the weak, and on the part of the weak how to escape from the strong.

But centuries ago, in an obscure province of the Roman Empire, there appeared a Jewish workingman, a world Savior, who said, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." "Do unto others as ye would that others should do unto you." "One is your Father, even God, and all ye are brethren." And slowly, oh, how slowly, that new ideal of human relationships has been emerging into the life of the world. In the matter of trade and industry—there are men not yet old who have seen the business ethics of America transmuted, so that what would have been the accepted practice of a generation ago would now put a man behind prison bars; and thank God for the men who are still pointing us forward to a better day of cooperation and brotherhood in business!

In society, from child-welfare work to national prohibition, how the sense of human responsibility for one another and human obligation has been gripping the hearts of men! And in politics, even in politics, what changes have we seen within a few years! The nineteenth century, as has often been said, was the age of nationalism; it was the time for the growth of huge empires, the estab-

lishment of foreign dominion over many peoples. Then came the Great War which began to focus our thinking on international relations, especially when the new ideal found superb expression through the lips of one of history's outstanding moral prophets, our War President, Woodrow Wilson; and militarism and imperialism, whether in Germany, or France, or Great Britain, or Japan, or America, were revealed as sin. "Sin is not imputed when there is no law," but when this higher standard, this Christian standard was once raised, when in the light of this new ideal men saw the truth of God about the relations of races and nations to one another, sin was revealed. Christianity had created a new problem —how to deal with a sin which had never before been recognized as a sin. The Washington Conference was called, of course, because of French Indo-China and Hong Kong and spheres of influence and Shantung and Manchuria and all the rest of them; but those things would have gone unchallenged, and did go almost unchallenged, just a few years ago; until the world awakened one morning and cried, "Stop, has the Golden Rule any place after all in politics? Have little and backward peoples any rights which strong and progressive peoples are bound to respect? Are justice and equality and freedom and humanity nothing but the watchwords of an abstract political philosophy, or have they any application

to diplomatic affairs?" Here was a new question, and Christianity had raised it. Christianity, I say, with this teaching and this standard and this ideal, is responsible for these very problems with which we wrestle; and we Christians must hold to this gain and advance this standard. Nothing but the mind of Christ must now be the test of our dealings with other peoples!

For Christianity alone can solve the problem which it has helped to create. Revolutions never go backward. The way out is always forward. I suppose there would have been no World War if it had not been for the existence of certain alliances and ententes; but the way to world peace does not involve breaking up these alliances into their separate national units and letting each nation go its own willful way, but rather the creation of a more inclusive league that shall take in all the contending countries. Industrial war has become more intense, more fierce, with the union on the one side of the forces of capital and on the other side of the forces of labor into vast aggregations of men and money and power; but the way out is not to break up these unions but to create a more inclusive union which shall take both labor and capital within its scope. I suppose the existence of religious denominations has often been divisive in its influence; but the remedy is no vain attempt to return to a primitive homogeneity but an ad-

vance to unity in diversity. Edwin Markham, the poet of democracy, has put it well:

> He drew a circle which left me out,
> Heretic, alien, a thing to flout;
> But love and I had the wit to win—
> We drew a circle that took him in.

Christianity is always on the side of the larger circle; and when conditions in Japan and America seem to place the differing interests of these countries in conflict, it is the business of the Christian nation to draw the larger circle of common interest and brotherly love, that God's will may be done. "He hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth," and "Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity."

Now, that Christianity has already had somewhat to do with these racial problems is not mere matter of theory but matter of experience. Read a few words written not by a missionary but by a scientist, an explorer, a world traveler, a civil administrator under the British Government—Sir Harry Johnston. "The missionaries of Christianity have taught the great imperishable dogmas of Pity, of the Brotherhood of Mankind, of Sobriety, Continence, Honesty, respect for Justice, Truth, and Reason, and the maintenance of

a healthy mind in a healthy body. They broke down the barriers between the white, yellow, red, brown, and black races of mankind which had arisen since the Neolithic age. They taught the race of colored skin to understand the white man as he really was, in his good and bad aspects; and they taught or tried to teach the unwilling white listeners what the so-called savage, the so-called backward peoples wanted, deserved, expected, feared, and were fit for. . . . The missionaries of Christianity from the sixteenth century onwards represent something like a cosmic force, a force which is defying the natural laws of evolution and profoundly affecting the future of the human species, keeping it perhaps as a single species with local variations instead of allowing it by internecine warfare and isolation to become molded into diverse species."

Do you see? The missionaries and their doctrines not simply snatching a man here and there out of eternal destruction but changing the life of our planet and holding men as members of one single race!

If we are considering, then, what may be done for the less privileged nations of the Orient, we have seen that something can be accomplished from the outside by the people here in America—by overcoming the sins of our national life, by casting out racial prejudice and intolerance, by respecting the sovereignty and rights of all other

nations, by promoting international peace. But the greatest thing, after all, that can be done must be done from within. China's worst enemy is not Great Britain, not Japan, but China; not merely by something that is done in Washington, but by something that happens in Peking, in Hankow, is China to be saved. Japan's salvation, and Korea's, depend not simply on what we may do in this country of ours, but on what they only may do in that country of theirs. No amount of international justice or international kindness will transform the life of these ancient peoples unless something happens within as well as without.

What does China need most? A hundred things have been indicated, a hundred prescriptions have been made. Here are a few of the most significant: China needs unity, stability, intelligence, integrity, unselfish patriotism. What does Japan need? Japan needs, among other things, loyalty to mankind as well as loyalty to family and to Emperor, confidence in the ways of peace and of service rather than the ways of mastery. But do you not notice that these are all spiritual qualities? And where shall China and Japan and Korea secure these spiritual qualities? I do not know any teacher, any reformer, any savior who can give these qualities to the Far East, unless it be our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ. He wrote wisely who said, "Not until right is founded upon reverence will it be secure; not until duty is based

upon love will it be complete; not until liberty is based upon eternal principles will it be full, equal, lofty, and universal"; and how shall the eternal principles of reverence and love be established if not by His hand?

I doubt not that you have been interested in the fact that the Premier of Japan has recently called in conference representatives of the religions of Japan. It is not the first time that such a meeting has been held. Once or twice before, the Minister of Home Affairs has announced such a conference of the spokesmen of Shintoism, Buddhism, and Christianity, and a few years ago that summons constituted the first official recognition of Christianity as a religion on a par with Shintoism and Buddhism. But the recent conferences were unprecedented, in that they were called by the Premier himself. Viscount Kiyoura is profoundly interested in religion. Himself the son of a Buddhist priest, and having lived in the temple for a time in his youth, he emphasizes the importance of religion in the life of the Japanese people. Note the immense significance of such a call from such a man. While Japan has its system of education from the lowest schools to the highest, still its leading officials are propounding to the representatives of religion this problem: "What must Japan do to be saved? We want your help in creating for Japan such a dependable citizenship as Japan needs." It is testimony

from a very high source that education alone will never save a people. Something that grips the heart, that makes new the motives of men, is absolutely essential.

I have no time, of course, to take up in detail the problems of the Orient as they are to be touched by religion, but I will take a single illustration—the question of national unity. Nations, if they are to be strong and prosperous, must have within them some cohesive force that creates a genuinely national life. What power can hold a people together? In the smaller units the problem is simple. The family naturally coheres. When the families are united in clans the problem is not so easy, and when nations appear the problem is very complex. What forces are there that can make men really one? The finest type of fellowship is that which is based on a common faith, common ideals, and a common aim. Does Christianity make any such contribution to the life of the nation?

This has been a serious question in the Orient, as it has been indeed in other lands in earlier times; for to large numbers of the people of the earth Christianity has come as a foreign religion. The Greeks and the Romans received it as a Jewish religion; to the Anglo-Saxons it came as a Latin religion; to Orientals it has come in the guise of the Western world. And again and again fears have been expressed that the introduction of

such a foreign element into the life of the nation would tend to disrupt the nation, and instead of affording new foundations for the national life would interfere with the spirit of loyalty and thus injure the life which was so deeply cherished.

But, on the contrary, so far from being hostile to national sentiment, it has been found that Christianity affords the soundest basis for nationality. To what motive can you appeal to bind a people together in one coherent nation? I can think of but three; first the motive of fear—fear of the aggression of surrounding nations, a belief that the national territory is to be seriously impaired or the national existence altogether destroyed. Sometimes that will carry a nation to lofty heights of heroism, as witness France. Second, there is the appeal to national pride, greed, and ambition. The aggressive spirit, the desire to go out and master other peoples, may for a time rouse a high degree of national enthusiasm and enable great sacrifices to be made without murmur. But these motives surely are not those that will finally insure our national life! The appeal to fear is an abnormal appeal, and ultimately must have upon the national life a degrading and depressing effect. On the other hand, if we seek national unity by evoking the spirit of conquest, it necessarily implies fear in other nations, and cultivates in the nation which

indulges it an arrogance which the world cannot endure.

There is only one motive left to which you may safely appeal to secure and maintain your national unity—the idealistic motive, the shaping of some altruistic national purpose that shall command the enthusiasm of its people. It is true that when the first fine emotion dies away it has appeared repeatedly that nations have relapsed into their former indifference. In those early days of war enthusiasm, how gloriously the United States assembled its forces as a unit. There was the sense of comradeship in a noble crusade. But how are the mighty fallen! Unity gave place to dissension and class feeling; idealism seemed to lapse into materialism; and sacrifice sank back into self-indulgence. But if the idealistic motive can be steadily maintained, it is a motive and the only motive that can assure national greatness. Was that not what Queen Victoria meant when she said that England's greatness was built upon the Bible? What Gladstone meant when he said, "There is but one problem and that is the Gospel?" What General Grant meant when he said, "Hold fast to the Bible as the sheet anchor of your liberties?" It is "righteousness that exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people." Our trust is not in our palaces, our banks, our exchanges, our factories,

much less in our armies, but in those less material possessions which alone are the foundations for permanent prosperity. "After all those (baser) things do the Gentiles (the semi-barbarous, semi-civilized nations) seek." But if you would be the builders of the new world order, "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." Garfield cried when the news came of Lincoln's death, "God reigns and the Government at Washington still lives." It is only when God does reign in the life of a nation that the Government can live in vigor for the peace, the safety, and the progress of its people.

That is it. Christianity is the power which makes all things new. Before it old superstitions and cruelties and conflicts give way. Its announcement always is, "These that have turned the world upside down (that is, right side up) are come hither also." Christianity is the source of that democratic movement, of that emancipation of womanhood, of those uplifting and socializing elements in the life of America which constitute the richest treasure we have to bestow. Christianity gives us the sense of stewardship, places upon us the weight of obligation.

This Christianity is not only for us but for all the nations, the final and universal religion. If the world ever is to be one, then it must become one in its religion, for religion so touches the

deepest things in human character and human life that there can be no world unity which does not involve a unity of essential faith. And the only religion which has any promise of universality is the religion of Jesus Christ. Confucianism, Buddhism, Zoroastrianism and all the rest have their local appeal and they have their millions of adherents; but the only symbol of religion that is found in all lands, the only symbol that at this moment can command the reverence of nations the world around, is the cross of Jesus Christ, which brings the fullest revelation of God, of sin, of salvation, of duty, of power, of immortality. That is the religion which deals with universal needs and which makes not a racial or class but a human appeal. That is the religion which presents universal remedies, which is strongest among nations that are most advanced, and which appeals to the ultimate and highest motive of human character—love. That is the religion which affords the only sound basis for international ethics, in that it supplies the principles of national conduct, and teaches the spirit of world service and world organization, and produces the moral character upon which treaties and leagues must depend and the good will upon which peace must be built. That is the message which America owes to the Orient.

We dreamed that by the strength of our armies a new world might be builded, but we have awak-

ened from the dream. We were forced into the World War as a last desperate resort against armed invasion. But all that war could achieve was purely negative. It has no constructive power. As the builder of a new social order, war is and always will be a failure. Since the Armistice it has sometimes seemed that we were almost ready to confess to the non-Christian nations, "Lo, we have lost our faith in war. All that is worthiest in our national life has come to us not from Mars or from Mammon but from Christ. It was the pious Quakers, the pious Roman Catholics, the pious Methodists, that laid the foundations on which our Republic stands. And we bring to you the fruit of our experience. We would share with you the most precious of our national possessions. We offer you not merely treaties and conferences, but Christ. He is the Master Architect of time. He can build nations upon the foundations which cannot be shaken. We believe in the agencies of peace, in hospitals and orphanages and schools and churches and love more than in bullets and bombs and torpedoes. We believe in Jesus Christ."

The Orient has seen traders going into the East too often absorbed in their selfish or harmful purposes; it has seen diplomats, and the Eastern people have learned to distrust the Greeks, even bringing gifts, and to suspect always some scheme

of self-aggrandizement; it has seen visiting professors who undermined rather than built up the faith that was in its incipient stage. Books have gone, Western customs have gone, but thank God, the Christian missionary also goes! It is worth while to remember the words written a little time ago by an unknown pen, the pen of an obviously careful observer and impartial judge: "The Christian missionary is about the most useful person in the world. . . . The missionaries as a rule are working away at the same task in which Jesus seemed to be engaged. They are healing the sick, teaching the ignorant, training the little children, and steadily spreading through the dark places of the earth those fundamental principles of decency, humanity, kindness, honesty, and courage upon which civilization rests. Best of all, they are planting everywhere the only idea upon which any practical internationalism can ever be founded, the only thought upon which humanity as a whole can ever be organized." And it is well to listen to Mr. F. W. Stevens, the American representative in China of the international financial Consortium, as he challenged men who questioned the usefulness of the missionary—"Do you know of a single organized activity in China, on a scale of importance, that aims at moral improvement or that is calculated to bring it about, that is not traceable in its origin to the

Christian missions?" Only as Christ has been made known by our missionaries in the Orient is there help.

A few months ago I remember being some miles outside the city of Seoul, at a Christian meeting held in the shadow of a Buddhist temple, four or five hundred years old. When Columbus was sailing for America, that temple was there. An image of the Buddha, the Buddha of Mercy, sat looking down upon us. We sang, "Majestic sweetness sits enthroned upon the Savior's brow"; and then we could look up into the dull face of the Buddha sitting there. "He saw me plunged in deep distress, He flew to my relief"; and we looked again and saw the Buddha, passive and inert. Over the doorway was written the motto, "Peace and Prosperity," but Buddha did not descend to our help. Buddha left men to climb unaided the steep road that was to lead to Heaven. There was no

> "Love divine that stooped to share,
> Our sharpest pang, our bitterest tear."

Buddha would only watch, while Christ suffered and lifted.

In Buddhism, in Japan, there has been a very marked revival of activity during the last few years, perhaps because many of the young priests have been reading the New Testament. They have been preaching in the parks and in the

streets, using the stereopticon to draw crowds together. They have organized Young Men's Buddhist Associations, established by the thousands Sunday Schools patterned after our Christian organizations and using even our Christian hymns. There is nothing irreverent in that. They are to be praised for taking these hymns and recognizing their beauty and truth, even though they substitute the name of Buddha for the name of Christ. They have been teaching little children, "Buddha loves me, this I know," teaching them to sing, "All hail the power of Buddha's name." When I first heard that I wondered what they did when they came to the third stanza:

> Sinners, whose love can ne'er forget
> The wormwood and the gall,
> Go, spread your trophies at His feet
> And crown Him Lord of all.

I do not know what they can do. For while Buddhism may have something that distantly resembles our Christmas story, it has no Good Friday and no Easter Day; and when you have taken those out of Christianity you have cut out its very heart and vitality.

These ethnic religions, in the face of this call for some power adequate to make a dependable citizenship for the Orient, these old religions, much as they have done, are helpless in the face of modern conditions and modern demands.

Christianity and only Christianity can meet the need.

> I know of lands that are sunk in shame,
> Of hearts that faint and tire,
> And I know of a Name, a Name, a Name,
> Can set those lands on fire.

The fire has been lit and it does not easily go out. When it had been kindled in Southern Japan, and when by persecution it was apparently obliterated from the land, Roman priests came back more than two centuries later and found the cross and the Christians still glowing in some of those isolated communities among the hills. The fire does not easily go out. It is being kindled to-day in a myriad Oriental hearts and homes, kindled by the witness of martyrs, by the living testimony of faithful and sacrificial service. And this fire, which is slowly purifying individual and social thought and purpose and practice, is the one hope of the Orient.

It is Christianity or nothing. A little while ago a Hindu committed suicide in Japan because of loneliness and discouragement, leaving a message which read, "Christian missionaries, you are simply undermining Japan and all Asia." One could easily guess what he meant. Our Western education is finding place in the countries of the Orient and making it impossible for Asiatics to hold to their ancient faiths. In

the light of modern learning, these faiths cannot stand; and the wholesome restraints which they have upheld are being broken down. Our Western customs are going in and altering the old manners and conventionalities which have held the people to a path of some moral safety. We, by our contacts, are destroying the things upon which they depended. And I am quoting the solemn words of Lord Bryce when I say, "They have now nothing to live upon unless and until they are given the gospel of Jesus Christ."